

1054  
COMMENTARIES

AND

ESSAYS

PUBLISHED BY

*K. London*

THE SOCIETY

FOR PROMOTING THE

KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCRIPTURES.

---

VOLUME THE FIRST.

---

L O N D O N :

SOLD BY J. JOHNSON, NO. 72, ST. PAUL'S  
CHURCH-YARD.

3





# C O N T E N T S.

	Page
A SKETCH of the Plan of the Society for Promoting the Knowledge of the Scriptures	i.
I. An Attempt to illustrate John xiv. 1, 2, 3	1
II. A new Translation of Isaiah lii. 13.—liiii. 12. with Notes	31
III. The Illustration of Christ's last Discourse with his Disciples, continued. John xiv. 4, &c. to the End of the Chapter	51
IV. Critical Notes on the First Nineteen Verses of the First Chapter of Genesis	83
V. A Paraphrase on Rom. v. 8—19	94
VI. Concerning the Apostolic Benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 14	112
VII. A New Translation of Isaiah i.—xii; with Notes, supplementary to those of Dr. Lowth, Bishop of London, and containing Remarks on some Parts of his Translation and Notes	149
VIII. A Criticism on Genesis iv. 26	259
IX. Critical	

# C O N T E N T S.

IX.	Critical Notes on many Passages of the Old Testament	Page 267
X.	An Inquiry into the Evidence which points out Christ to have been only a Creature of the human Race, invested with extraordinary Powers from God; as it arises from his own Declarations, and those of his Apostles and Evangelists	391
XI.	Observations on Part of the 8th, 11th, and 12th Chapters of Daniel	467
XII.	A Gleaning of Remarks on Mr. Travis's attempt to Revive the exploded Text of 1 John v. 7.	511



## THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCRIPTURES.

...into the doctrine of the hypotheses, that the  
...contained, hath been to  
...the guide of human life.

AS it appears to be a point of some importance, that the specific design of the society should be perfectly comprehended, it may not be improper to request the attention of their future correspondents to the following circumstances.

To impress the human heart with just affections respecting the Almighty, and our fellow creatures—to animate us in the performance of our duty—and to qualify us for the enjoyment of substantial happiness, if not always in the present, yet most assuredly in a future scene, are the great ends and objects of religion: and constitute the characteristic excellence of the Christian institution.

And whenever that truly rational system of faith and practice, which is unfolded in the scriptures shall

shall be professed in its primeval purity—when the piety and benevolence which they inculcate, shall become vital principles of action and generally prevail, the salutary effects they will produce both upon individuals and communities, will add evidence irresistible to the divine authority of the gospel; and, at the same time that they diffuse harmony and peace over every scene of social life, will enable us with grateful hearts to fix our hopes of happiness on a foundation, which the calamities and temptations incident to humanity will assail in vain.

It perhaps is in a great measure owing to an injudicious, and indeed preposterous method of enquiry into the doctrine of the scriptures, that the divine revelation, therein contained, hath been so partially acknowledged as the guide of human life.

It has been too much the practice of those members of the Christian church, to whom the office of instruction has been delegated, to direct the attention of mankind to certain tenets of religion, which the authority of former ages, rather than the decisions of their unbiassed judgement, had taught them to respect as fundamental—to commence their own researches with an assumption of their truth—and to employ their learned labours in what proved, very frequently, a vain attempt to establish their conformity to holy writ.

Such was the process of ancient philosophy in its unsuccessful efforts to unfold the laws of the visible creation—to explain the works of God.

A theory,

A theory, or an hypothesis, framed by human fancy, anticipated what ought to have been the result of a laborious investigation into fact.

But when, ascending with steady step from each well established observation, human industry reversed the former process, and the conclusion flowed from experiment as its only proper source, truth disclosed itself to the enraptured understanding in its genuine simplicity; and the laws and ordinances stood revealed, which the great Creator had imposed upon the larger masses of material being, when he constructed the stupendous fabric of the world.

Let similar wisdom direct our movements, and similar success may be expected, when, with that humility and patient attention, which should ever accompany such researches, our labours are employed in the investigation of religious truth.

The word of God, revealed in the scriptures of both testaments, like the book of nature, lies open to us all—like the laws of nature, the doctrines of revelation may be conceived to be at once both simple and sublime—sufficient to affect the improved mind with wonder and delight, yet such as the most unlettered understanding may apprehend with facility, when the cloud of human prejudices, which has so long obscured the heavenly light of truth, shall be totally withdrawn.

The society presumes, that it will assist in the removal of these prejudices, and at the same time tend to inform the mind of the true believer with just and proper sentiments of the benevolence of the great



great Creator, exhibited in the gospel, that last best gift of God to man, if the friends to religious inquiry be invited sedulously to pursue, what may not unaptly be termed, the *analytic* mode of inquiry, into the genuine doctrines of the scriptures.

Instead of assuming a position, and attempting a demonstration of its truth, by authorities from scripture, which bears a resemblance to the *synthetic* method in philosophy, they would propose to invert the process, by previously establishing the genuine sense of those authorities, which may have been brought in evidence of the doctrine proposed.

An instance may assist in explaining their idea.

Let us suppose it was the design of a writer to treat upon the terms of man's final acceptance with the Almighty.

Such writer would probably state his own opinion in definite terms; and, after attempting by argument to evince the absurdity of the contrary sentiment, would proceed to establish the justness of his own, by authorities from holy writ.

The advocate for the opposite opinion would probably proceed nearly in a similar manner; he would attempt to establish its conformity to reason; and would endeavour to refute the arguments of his opponent, appealing also, where he saw occasion, to authorities from scripture.

If both parties were agreed with respect to the import of these authorities, and fairly cited whatever

in the original record related to the argument, the debate would soon be terminated. But the experience of ages bears testimony that the contrary is the fact: each party in the dispute controverting the interpretation imposed by his adversary, and with pertinacity adhering to his own.

The unedifying altercation is also frequently prolonged, by an imperfect recital of the passages, which are supposed to bear an immediate reference to the subject of debate—and by a series of arguments, depending upon the sense of particular words and detached sentences; little or no attention being observed, in the quotation of these authorities, to the general import of the context.

In such circumstances, it is not wonderful that prejudice should alternately exert a forcible, though latent power, over the minds of the opponent parties, and that the genuine doctrine of revelation should frequently elude the most laborious researches of them both.

Let us now suppose, that before the mind is warped in favour of any specific opinion, or warmed with controversy, we sit down to investigate the sense of a passage of scripture, with the same calm and composed temper, with which we examine a passage in a greek or roman classic, whose genuine sense we are studious to explore.

Unblinded by system, and exempt from every species of prejudice, we without partiality avail ourselves of all those lights of criticism, which the learned labours of others, as well as our own unbiased

biased judgment may afford ; and a clear conception of the one true meaning of the author soon rewards our toils.

Were this our invariable process in the exposition of the sacred page, a passage once elucidated and explained by those aids, which the present age enjoys in such superior measure, like a well established experiment in philosophy, might be appealed to with confidence—its recital would have the force of legal evidence in the pleadings of the opponent parties ; and could no longer be employed in the support of those baseless fabrics of divinity, which have so frequently dishonoured the Christian name.

We will now proceed more particularly to state that method of advancing scriptural knowledge, which we would wish to recommend.

Let us suppose a portion of a prophet, an evangelist, or other sacred writer to be chosen, which contains an incident, an admonition, or an argument, in some measure detached from the subsequent and preceding parts of scripture. The twenty-second chapter of Genesis, from the first verse to the nineteenth inclusive—the twenty-third chapter of Isaiah—the seventeenth chapter of St. John's gospel—the first ten verses of the thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans—the fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, may be proposed as specimens of such detached portions.

The commentator upon such passages would probably think it expedient, in the first place, to inquire into those preceding incidents, and concomitant



mitant circumstances, of which it may appear necessary to form a just conception, before he enters upon an explanation of the purport of sentences and words.

Preliminaries being discussed, if any various readings worthy of attention should be noticed, the expositor may think it proper, by the means of those assistances, which Kennicott, Mill, Bengelius, or Wettstein may afford, to support the received reading; or establish such alteration in the text, as the rules of sound criticism shall suggest.

An accurate translation of the passage, with proper divisions into paragraphs or sentences, pointed with the utmost correctness possible, would greatly tend to the information and improvement of the learned, as well as the unlearned reader.

The exhibiting of a summary idea of the import of each paragraph, in a well digested *commentary*, in the manner of Bishop Hurd upon Horace's Epistles to Augustus and the Piso's, would afford further assistance to the enquirer into scripture truth; the sense of each paragraph being confirmed by references to other parts of scripture, where the same or a similar subject is discussed.

Notes critical and philological, and explanatory of allusions to rites and customs, and historical facts, with such references to scripture, as tend to explain the peculiar phrastology, may follow next in order.

Lastly, such conclusions, doctrinal and moral, as appear of sufficient importance, and are deducible by

by just inference from the passage in question, may with great advantage close the work.

It may possibly be urged, that the same or a similar process has already been adopted by many commentators upon scripture.

But it is presumed, that it is one thing to write a continued commentary upon scripture—another to comment upon a detached portion of scripture, in the manner which has now been hinted. In a general commentary, those preliminary circumstances, on which the just comprehension of the passage so much depends, would interfere with the execution of the author's purpose; who, instead of commenting upon separate passages, proceeds in a regular tenor to comment upon verses and words; the general import being, frequently, incompletely noticed, and consequently the verses and words themselves imperfectly understood, if not erroneously explained.

Although it appears necessary, in explaining the intentions of the society, to delineate that form of composition, which they conceive would most effectually promote the knowledge of the scriptures; yet it is by no means their intention to require a rigid conformity to any specific model, from their future correspondents. On the contrary, they will gladly admit such tracts, as proceed upon a less extensive plan, provided it be evidently the direct and primary intention of the author to elucidate the sacred text. Essays, written professedly in support of particular tenets and forms of doctrine, are liable to the objections stated in the preceding pages: but every

every communication of the friends of revelation, which tends to the advancement of scriptural knowledge, whether it affords an explanation of a rite or ceremony—of an allusion to the manners and principles of the age—of a point of civil history, or, of a single sentence or expression, contained in the bible, will be received with thankfulness, as intirely coinciding with their purpose.

The right of private judgment in religious concerns, and of worshipping the great Creator as our reason and our conscience shall approve, cannot be invaded, upon any pretence whatever, without injury,—nor without impiety resigned. In a country, professedly Christian, improvement in scriptural knowledge, with the consequent practice of every divine and social virtue, may be expected to flourish or decrease, in proportion as these rights are more or less extensively enjoyed. It is therefore the purpose also of the present institution to assist in the circulation of such tracts, as vindicate to every member of the community the enjoyment of these invaluable privileges, in their unlimited extent: The society being firmly persuaded, that to employ our noblest faculty upon its noblest object,—our powers of reason upon religion, is at once, the unalienable right—the highest praise,—and the primary obligation of man.

In the prosecution of these designs, the laity and clergy of every denomination and description are immediately interested; and every pious person, according to the talent with which heaven hath intrusted him, however private may be his situation, may occasionally assist, either by his communications, or his support.

The



( 8 )

The business of the society will be transacted in the metropolis, in conformity to its rules and regulations; but much vigour and effect may be afforded to their labours by their distant members and other correspondents. By their concurring endeavours, the society will acquire stability and strength; and their attempts to illustrate the sacred writers be productive, it is hoped, of happy consequences to the general interests of truth and virtue.

Influenced by these motives, and not without hope of the general countenance and support of serious and liberal minded christians, it is the intention of the society to publish such original papers, explanatory of the scriptures, and also in vindication of the right of free inquiry and of private judgment, correspondent to the scheme of their institution, as shall be communicated and approved.

With the same views, it is another part of the design of the society, to reprint such tracts or papers, upon these important subjects, as shall be thought worthy of renewed attention; and which, from the distance of the time of their original publication, or from the scarcity of the books wherein they are to be found, may escape the notice of persons who would principally be benefited by them.

In both cases, however, they propose, invariably to abide by the specific description of their plan, contained in the form of institution.

It is recommended to those who may be disposed to transmit any paper to the society, and at the same time inclined to withhold their name from the public, to adopt some signature sufficiently distinguishing, according as their own discretion shall suggest.

In

In the mode of publication, the society do not intend to confine themselves to time, or quantity of letter-press, as is the case in regular periodical publications; but to publish, occasionally, in successive numbers, and at irregular intervals, such papers as shall have been approved; without observing any other order or preference than the time of their communication.

The expence of printing will be defrayed by the society, and their publications will be circulated by the members in such manner, as each shall judge most conducive to the success of the society's design. In aid however of this part of their plan, which might otherwise be limited in its operation, they purpose to comply with the ordinary method observed in literary publications, and to direct their papers to be sold by their bookseller.

---

*It is requested that the correspondents of the society would address their letters to any of the members, or, to Mr. Joseph Johnson, Bookseller, in St. Paul's Church-yard, London.*

The expense of printing will be defrayed by the Treasury, and their publications will be circulated by the same authority as the ordinary revenue papers.



# COMMENTARIES

AND

## ESSAYS.

### I. An Attempt to illustrate JOHN XIV. 1. 2. 3.

*Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And when I go, and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you to myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.*

THIS portion of the New Testament, which it is proposed to explain and illustrate, is near the beginning of Christ's last farewell discourse with his chosen disciples, a little before his death. It's true meaning seems to have been hitherto overlooked by all the expositors and commentators. For it has been uniformly, on all hands, presumed, as a point unquestioned, that by *the mansions* here spoken of, *In my Father's house are many mansions*, are intended the abodes of future happiness; and that, in thus addressing his disciples, at this season, when their minds were drooping under the sad thought of

N<sup>o</sup>. I. B his

his being soon to leave them, our Lord's aim was to relieve and comfort them by an assurance, that there was another world, other and better scenes in heaven, to which he himself should be removed, and where he should be still mindful of them; and that therefore they should not be too much concerned at his departure, as it would be the means of opening an entrance for them into the regions of virtue and eternal felicity, where they would soon rejoin him, never to part more.

Without all doubt, this is the doctrine of the gospel in many places; and it is a hope full of consolation and support to all the faithful followers of Christ, in their separation from those who are justly dear to them here below, and in their expectation of one day seeing him their kind and affectionate Lord and Master, as it would be to those his first disciples, when they should lose him.

But the following reasons appear to be of sufficient weight to convince us, that our Lord did not intend to point to any thing of the kind here. For

1st. As these, his eleven disciples, were men destined by the extraordinary providence of the heavenly Father, to take his office, and supply his place after he should be gone away, and who were appointed to teach the way of salvation to a world buried in vice and ignorance, in the midst of mighty opposition and dangers on all sides: it is not likely that their divine master should immediately accost them with a positive assurance of heaven's happiness, and of his making it his business to prepare their portion in it, without saying any thing of the great work that was before them, and the pains and fidelity required in the discharge of it. Such a method of conduct and omission in him, cannot be supposed; and the less, when to have told these his followers, that they might reckon upon the possession

of

of the bliss of heaven at all events, might tend to make them careless, instead of being a spur and encouragement to their exertions in the arduous province assigned them.

2d. It is also very improbable, if, by his *Father's house*, where Christ was to go and prepare a place for them, he understood the state of future happiness, that upon such a subject he should say to his apostles, as he here does, *if it were not so, I would have told you*; as if it were possible for these his chosen disciples to entertain a doubt or suspicion about the reality of that state, which he had again and again, in a variety of ways, and in the strongest and clearest manner inculcated, in his instructions to them. And this too, when it was become a general persuasion among his followers. For we find, in the account of Lazarus being raised to life, John xi. 23. 24. that when to console his sister, *Jesus said unto her, thy brother shall rise again: Martha said unto him, I know that he shall rise again, in the resurrection, at the last day.*

3d. As our Lord's whole discourse, which lasts to the end of chap. xvi, relates only to his apostles; the promise with which he here encourages them must be something which concerned them alone. But if heaven be the place where he was going to prepare *mansions* for them; and his *coming again* and *taking them to himself*, be interpreted, as is commonly done, of his raising them to life at the last day by the power of God, and their participation with him in his glory and happiness in the heavenly world: there was nothing in this peculiar to the apostles; for they tell us, that all other faithful followers of Christ shall be restored to life and enter into the state of the blessed at the same time with themselves; where they are to be ever with their Lord. 1 Thess. iv. 12—17.



but 4. It is moreover to be observed, that it will be found, in comparing the different parts of Christ's whole discourse together, that in these mansions which he was to prepare for his chosen disciples, difficulties and dangerous trials would still await them, and some of them would be exposed even to extreme sufferings and death. But in that world above, we are told, that *God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes: and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.* Revel. xxi. 4.

We are therefore to look for some other interpretation of this our Lord's consolatory address, more suited to the situation of his apostles and to his own. For prudent, sensible persons always say what is adapted to the present occasion and circumstance, especially upon matters of importance. And He, in whom dwelt a divine wisdom, would not most surely be wanting here.

Now at this moment, the holy Jesus, by the knowledge imparted to him from God, was fully apprised, that he himself, within the short space of three or four hours, should be betrayed into the hands of his enemies, and hurried on to his trial and a violent death.

He likewise foresaw the effect this would have upon his disciples. They would think their connection with him quite dissolved. He had been giving them indeed instructions all the time he had been with them, how they were to teach and reform mankind after his death, and become the instruments of saving them from the sad consequences of their sins in a future world. But then, when he had left them, in such a way, how could they go on by themselves? They, a few, poor, unexperienced, unlearned men, against the great and the learned, who

who had taken off their master, and would most probably endeavour to destroy them.

Consider on the other hand, what must have been the state of mind of the blessed Jesus, in this crisis of things.

From a child he had been taught that he was born for the greatest purposes, to be employed in a most extraordinary manner in bringing about the designs of the supreme benevolent parent of all things, for the good of the whole human race. This would doubtless be suggested, and impressed upon him from his infancy, by those about him, especially by his pious mother, who was in part acquainted with the councils of the Almighty concerning him: for divine providence never uses supernatural means, where it's ends can be effected in the ordinary and natural course of events. Of Jesus's early wisdom, and love to God, to piety and virtue, we have a singular instance recorded, when he was only twelve years old. Luke ii. 42.—49.

When he afterwards entered on his public ministry, with high gifts of the holy spirit, *i. e.* of a divine wisdom and power, conferred on him at his baptism by John, to enable him to fulfill it: with what ardent zeal and indefatigable labours did he set about and execute the great work? Wholly intent on teaching men heavenly truth, he seized every opportunity for it, in season and out of season. It was his *meat and drink* (John. iv. 34.) thus *to do the will of his heavenly Father*. He lived, and was desirous to live, for no other end.

His whole mind, and all his powers, were bent and employed to compleat the design of his divine mission, to bring men out of a state of sin and misery to virtue and true happiness.

Now what, think we, would this divine Saviour and heavenly teacher be most earnest and solicitous to

to inculcate upon his chosen disciples, as his last parting words of advice to them, before his death? something surely that related to the point and business, which he himself had chiefly and alone at heart, and which could be none other than their great office, to which they had had a divine call, of teaching and reforming mankind, which they were to sustain after him; and how they might best and most effectually acquit themselves in it.

Taking these circumstances along with us, let us attend to and scan what our Lord says upon the present occasion; and his manner of introducing it.

The words with which he here begins, are but the continuation of a discourse held with his eleven disciples after supper, upon Judas's having abruptly withdrawn himself in order to betray him. Upon this he had told them with great affection, of his being to go away very soon from them: alluding plainly to his death, which was near at hand. This however he spoke of in a strain of great exultation; *Therefore when he was gone out, Jesus said; now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him. If God be glorified in him, God shall also glorify him in himself, and shall straightway glorify him.* John. xiii. 31. 32.

The joyful prospect of promoting the virtue and final salvation of mankind by his approaching sufferings and death in the cause of the gospel, he calls his being *glorified*; esteeming it the highest honour that could be done to him. For he had no views of glory or exaltation to himself, but what resulted from his labours to serve others, especially to serve them in their most important interests of another world. And he speaks of *God being thus also glorified by him*, because of the most deserved glory and honour and thanksgiving, that would by his death, and the beneficial consequences of it, redound and be for ever due to the Almighty Father, and sovereign disposer of all things; who had ordained



ordained the whole of the gracious plan and all its parts, and had appointed the several actors in it, himself among the rest, and would see to the final happy execution of it.

But his disciples being sad, at his talk of going away from them, (yet by no means (a) apprehending in what way it would happen, though he had so often told them of his death,) and concerned what would become of themselves, he says to them;

*Let not your hearts be troubled; ye believe in God, (b) believe also in me. viz.* "Suffer not yourselves to be too much dejected or discouraged by any thing that shall happen to me. And doubt not but it will all turn out for good, and to serve the great design of my mission. Ye believe the things which God revealed and promised of old to our forefathers by his prophets: Give credit also to me, who have given you such satisfactory proofs of my being the Messiah, and sent by him; and depend upon the promises I have made you of all needful assistance and support, whatever befalls me."

*In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you.*

We, in consequence of our prejudices, have annexed the idea of heaven, the place of God's more immediate and glorious presence, to this language, and presume *that* to be his *Father's house*, of which

Christ

(a) This affords another and very strong presumption, that Christ did not now speak, nor his apostles understand him as speaking of another world, because they did not think he would suffer death: so that it would have been unreasonable, and foreign to their ideas and expectations, for him to have held such language to them.

(b) The like language, with relation to himself and almighty God, which Christ uses, is applied to Moses and the same almighty Being. *And Israel saw that great work, which the LORD did upon the Egyptians: and the people feared the LORD, and believed the LORD, and his servant Moses.*

Christ speaks: But as there had nothing gone before that could lead them to it, the phrase would raise no such thought in his apostles. They would not suppose him to allude to another world, but to something that immediately concerned them in this. For his *Father's house*, the same as the house of God, the house of the LORD, of Jehovah, would remind them immediately of their tabernacle and temple, continually so called in their sacred books, and oftentimes even by God himself, as it was built by his command, and for his more solemn worship. And this temple our Saviour himself also in another place, styles, *my Father's house: make not my Father's house, an house of merchandise*; as recorded by our evangelist himself. John. ii. 16.

But then, as they would be sensible, that though he used such an expression, he could not literally intend Solomon's temple, as the place where they were to have their promised mansions, because these were appropriated to the priests only; and moreover he had predicted it's destruction, and told them, that God's true worship was to be fixed to no one particular place, but his temple would be every where, in the hearts of his true worshippers, wheresoever found: they would consider with themselves, what other sense they should put upon his words.

And as it was only on account of God's extraordinary presence with and protection over their nation, which he had often manifested in his temple at Jerusalem, that it was called his house; it would not be difficult for them to conclude, if they had not heard it before from the Lord Jesus, or if he did not more fully explain himself upon the occasion, that the house of God upon earth, *his Father's house*, must now be the society of his true disciples, the christian church or congregation every where, the family of the true worshippers of the Father; among whom he would  
manifest

manifest his extraordinary presence and protection, in a much more signal manner, by the various powers and gifts of his holy spirit bestowed upon them.

That they would most probably put this construction upon their divine master's words, as styling themselves and the whole body of those who should profess themselves his disciples, his *Father's house*, the house of God, will be abundantly confirmed by the frequent use of the same language in the writings of the apostles afterwards.

In the first epistle to Timothy, addressed to him while he resided at Ephesus, where he had been recommended as minister and teacher of the church or congregation of christians in that place by St. Paul, the apostle tells him, that lest he should not be able to come to Ephesus himself, as he had intended, he had sent him directions for his conduct; *that thou mayest know* (says he, 1 Tim. iii. 15.) *how thou oughtest to behave thyself, (c) a pillar and support of truth, in the house of God, which is the church of the living God.*

Observe here, that the church of christians at Ephesus, is by the apostle stiled *God's house*, (or in our Lord's words, the *Father's house*,) *the church of the living God.*

In another place, our apostle describes, in the very same language, the converted heathens, as being admitted to the privilege of being the church and people of God, equally with the Jews themselves, who had formerly been particularly favoured and distinguished by the almighty Being.

Ephes. ii. 19. 20. &c. *Now therefore ye are no longer guests, (d) and sojourners, but fellow citizens with the*

(c) James, Peter, and John, are called *pillars*, Gal. ii. 9.

(d) I give here Dr. Lardner's translation. See a fine criticism of that excellent writer, upon this verse, in his supplement, vol. iii. p. 129—133.



*the saints, and God's domestics; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. In whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth into an holy temple (e) in the Lord: i. e. "In Christ, all his followers, " Jews and Gentiles, how separated soever formerly, " are now united and cemented together into a holy " christian temple." In whom you also are build- ed together for an habitation (a dwelling house, κατοικηριον) of God through the spirit. i. e. "By means " also of Christ, through the preaching of the " gospel, you heathen converts are become a most " important part of this holy temple, the christian " church. For as God formerly dwelt in the jewish " tabernacle and temple, by his extraordinary fa- " vours and manifestations of himself to that peo- " ple: So He now dwells in you by the divine " gifts and power of the holy spirit conferred upon " you."*

We meet with the same language in the epistle to the Hebrews, where the author styles the jewish and christian church respectively, *the house of God*, and this in such a way as shews how familiar an expres- sion it was with the apostle and the hebrew people to whom he is writing, for otherwise he would not have used it; and therefore how easily and readily our

(e) *an holy temple in the Lord*] As the Lord here intended is probably Christ and not God, the words may be paraphrased, "an holy christian temple," agreeably to our apostle's use of the phrase in other places. So Gal. i. 22. *I was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea which were in Christ*—i. e. "to the christian churches in Judea." Rom. xvi. 7. *who are of note, who also were in Christ before me.* i. e. "were christians before me." 2 Cor. v. 17. *If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.* i. e. "if any man be a christian," &c. See also Rom. ix. 1.—2 Cor. xii. 2.—1 Thess. iv. 16. &c. &c.

our Lord's disciples, when he spake to them of *his Father's house*, might understand him as intending the church of his disciples at large, illuminated by the holy spirit of God; the true worshippers of the Father under the gospel.

The apostle is proving to his countrymen the superiority of Christ to Moses, their divine lawgiver and prophet, with a view to preserve them in those perilous times in Judea where they lived, from falling away from the gospel which they had embraced. As the passage is somewhat obscure in one part, and has been well explained by Mr. James Peirce, one of the most learned and able critics of our nation in sacred literature, I shall produce the whole of it, with his paraphrase and a few of his remarks upon it, and a few others.

Hebrews iii. 1.—7. 1. 2. *Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the apostle (†) and high priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to him that (g) appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house.* 1. 2. *Wherefore, holy brethren, who partake of the heavenly calling, in order to your rightly improving the advantage you are favoured with, be careful to consider Jesus Christ, whom I have been representing to you as the apostle and high priest of our*

(†) "*the apostle of our profession*"] Here our author refers to what he had said of Christ, in the two former chapters. "Christ is the apostle of our profession, as he was sent of God to institute the christian profession, and God spake to men by him" Chap. i. 2; the gospel began to be spoken by him, Chap. ii. 3."

(g) "*Τὸ ποινιστὴν αὐτοῦ, to him that appointed him.*"] These words were improved by some zealots for orthodoxy among the ancients, as an occasion of cavilling against this

our religion; who I was faithful to God, the Father, who appointed him, exactly executing the commands he gave him; and of whom the same may be said, which God testified of his servant Moses, that he was faithful (h) in all his house.

3. 4. For this man, counted worthy of more glory than Moses, in as much as he who hath builded

“ epistle; because they thought it spake of Christ as *made*, as the  
 “ word more commonly imports, and is indeed rendered in the  
 “ margin of our bibles: and they could not relish an author who  
 “ said, that God made Christ. This gave no uneasiness to those  
 “ more ancient and learned fathers, who lived before those warm  
 “ debates, and who did not stick to speak of Christ, as *ποίημα*,  
 “ *ποίημα, γένημα*, &c. *the workmanship, creature, offspring*,  
 “ &c. of the Father. But to say the truth, the objectors  
 “ needed not to have been disgusted at the epistle upon this account,  
 “ since there is no necessity of taking the word in the sense they  
 “ did, as though it must unavoidably import a proper creation:  
 “ for it often imports no more than what our translators here ex-  
 “ pressed, *viz. appointed*. So Mark iii. 14. *ἐποίησε δούλους*  
 “ *He ordained (or appointed) twelve*. But however needlessly  
 “ they imagined our author to speak of Christ here, as *made* or  
 “ created by the Father; yet it must be owned that the notion of  
 “ Christ’s being equal to the Father, doth not very well consist  
 “ with his being subject to the Father’s *appointment*. But if men  
 “ will be displeased with this epistle on such an account, there will  
 “ perhaps be no book of the New Testament left, that will not  
 “ offend them.”

(h) These words are taken from Numb. xii 7. where God speaks in this manner concerning Moses,



*the house, (i) hath more honour than the house. For every house is builded by some man: but he that built all things is God.*

*visibly it is himself to build the church and families*

*but he who is the original founder and supreme*

*head of the church, and of all families and societies,*

*is God, the Father.*

*5. 6. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after:*

*But (k) Christ as a Son over his own house: Whose house*

as he is much more nearly related to the head and founder of the family, who must be supposed to have the greatest honour of the family. For every house, or family has some founder, or head; but he who is the original founder and supreme head of the church, and of all families and societies, is God, the Father.

5. 6. Now Moses was indeed related to him, but it was only as a servant, and he was faithful in that relation, for a testimony of the things that were afterwards to be revealed.

(i) "The author seems to have omitted one part of his argument, leaving it to be supplied by his readers, a thing not unusual, and it is not very obscure, all things considered. Thus then I understand his reasoning. "The nearer the relation in which any one stands to the head of the family, the greater honour must that person have in virtue of that relation. But Christ, as a Son, is more nearly related to God, the head of the church, which is his family, than was Moses as a servant. Therefore Christ is worthy of more honour than Moses." The next verse confirms this account: *For every house is builded by some person; but he who built all things is God: i. e.* "as every house has some head, who is the most honourable in it, so God, who is the supreme head and founder of the church, and all other societies and families, is the most honourable of all; and, the nearer the relation is, in which any stand to him, the more honourable they must be."

(k) *Christ as a Son over his own house.*] Peires proves at large, how very blameable our translators were for inserting the word

are we; if we build fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope unto the end.

who must be separated to have the greatest honor of the family. For every house or family has some founder, or head; but he who is the origin-

vealed. But Christ was faithful to him as a Son appointed by him to be over his (God's) house; and we are God's house or family, if we steadfastly retain unto the end of our lives,

even when it should only be *his*, (that is, God's) house. And *Paul*, upon the place, says directly;— "A very wrong translation. It is *over his*, viz. God's house; *ἐπὶ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ*: "the *αὐτοῦ*, *his*, plainly is to be referred to *God*, *God*, ver. 4. "as it is in the 5th verse: Agreeably to 1 Tim. iii. 15, and "1 Cor. iii. 19. *Ye are God's building; his house.*"

We may not omit to remark here; that though the apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews, proves the superiority of Christ to Moses, from that nearer and dearer relation in which the former may be said to stand to Almighty God, as being spoken of by him under the tender appellation of a Son, and receiving greater marks of his paternal regards and preference than Moses, in those more extraordinary gifts of the spirit, and communications of wisdom, and of the divine councils relating to mankind bestowed upon him: yet, at other times, and in other respects, *Christ* is spoken of and considered as the *servant of God*, as well as *Moses*. Such is the description and character of the *Messiah*, as the chosen and beloved servant of God, by the prophet *Isaiah*, xiii. 1. whose words the evangelist *Matthew* thus adopts and applies to *Christ*: xiii. 17. 18. *That it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by Isaiah the prophet, saying; Behold, my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, &c.* Our Lord also speaks continually of himself, as sent by the Father; that is, the messenger, the servant of the Father. And his apostles, after his resurrection, in their prayer to almighty God, speak still of their exalted lord and master, as being *God's servant*: For, of a truth, say they, against thy holy servant *Jesus*, both *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, with the gentiles, and the people of *Israel*, were gathered together: and again—ver. 30. *Beangelius* saw the necessity of allowing that the apostles here call their master, *God's servant*. His note is ver. 27. *ναῖσα οὖν, (ministrum tuum) cujus typus David, nam hic eodem nomine appellatur v. 25. i.e. "thy servant Jesus, of whom David was a type, and who is here "spoken of by the same appellation, ver. 25. who by the mouth of "thy servant David, hath said, &c."*

lives, that hope, which with boldness and glorying we professed, at our first embracing the christian religion.

The same apostle, exhorting the christian church in the city of Corinth, to purity and holiness, says, (1 Cor. iii. 16.) *Know ye not, that ye are the temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy: for the temple of God is holy; which temple ye are.*

And again (2 Cor. vi. 16.) *Ye are the temple of the living God: as God hath said, (Levit. xxvii. 11, 12.) I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.*

In both these instances, christians are expressly named, *the temple, or house of God*; and so called, because of the spirit of God dwelling in them, i. e. on account of those extraordinary miraculous gifts and powers, that were bestowed, in that first age of the gospel, upon it's professors, until it had taken root, and could support itself by the means of his ordinary providence.

I apprehend now, that there can be little doubt about the language here used by our Lord; that *his Father's house* where he engaged to make provision for his disciples, was not the abode of the blessed in heaven, but the church or society of believers upon earth; and so called, because the heavenly Father resided as it were among them, by the gifts of his holy spirit, i. e. of a divine power bestowed upon them.

And this being settled, it will not be difficult to discover and define, what is intended by the *mansions* in his Father's house, where he was to prepare a place for them.

IN



IN using the term *μονή*, a mansion, station, for which soon after the word *τοπος*, a place, is adopted as synonymous, the allusion seems to be kept up to the service of God, in the temple, where the different priests and ministers had various stations and employments; and our Lord intimates thereby, that something of the same nature would obtain with respect to his disciples.

That the language here used by him; *I go to prepare a place for you*; *παρασκευάζει σταθμούς τοπον υμιν*, refers not merely to any particular place where they were to be, but to an office which they were to fill, will appear from the use of the word *τοπος*, (1) in the scriptures and in other writings.

Acts i. 25. In the address of the apostles to almighty God, for direction in their choice of a successor to Judas, it should not seem likely that they would say, as is the common interpretation, that the unhappy man was already consigned to the place and state of torment. Such reflections, however well founded, are improper for us to make in our prayers, and at all times it were surely better to leave judgment to Him, to whom it belongs. It is therefore a satisfaction to find, that the just construction of the

(1) The following observation of the late justly celebrated Hebrew Professor, Dr. Hunt of Oxford, greatly strengthens the interpretation here given.

" It may likewise be observed, says he, that the same Greek interpreters in both places translate *מקום* by *τοπος*. Is it because they read *מקום*? Or did they, by their *τοπος*, understand the same as we do by our english *Place*; viz. *rank*, *office*, *post*, *preferment*, &c. It is certain, according to *Stephens*, that *τοπος* may signify the same with *τάξις*, which is not only *ordo*, but *officium*, *munus*, &c.

Observations on several passages in the Book of Proverbs, by Thomas Hunt, D. D. p. 126.

the words and explanation of them, does not favour such an idea. For it has often been remarked, that they should be thus rendered: *Thou, LORD, who knowest the hearts of all men, shew which of these two thou hast chosen, to take part of this ministry or apostleship, (from which Judas by transgression fell,) that he may go to his proper office.*

It has been well observed, after others, by a good critic, whose whole remark I have put in the margin, (m) for the satisfaction of the learned; that the clause, *that he may go to his proper place or office*, relates not to Judas, but to the person who

(m) Πορεύσθαι εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδίου. Facile assentior cels. Heumanno aliisque interpretibus, qui phrasin hanc de successore Judæ explicant, ita ut infin. πορεύσθαι pendeat a verbo λαβεῖν et vertendum sit, *ut abeat ad locum suum, sc. ut locum suum accipiat*. Quo sensu per τὸν τοῦ ἰδίου munus apostolicum intelligendum est. Non obstat explanationi, quod tum phrasen, λαβεῖν τοῦ κληροῦ τῆς διακονίας, et hæc πορεύσθαι εἰς τὸν τοῦ ἰδίου, tautologica esse viderentur; prior enim locutio de munere hoc conferendo, posterior de partibus his suscipiendis et peragendis intelligi potest. Neque etiam premir hanc sententiam, quod objicit Elmsnerus, τὸν τοῦ ἰδίου illius esse, qui πορεύσθαι dicitur. Nam locus proprius dicitur, non qui talis jam erat, sed fieri post electionem demum debebat, quo sensu apostolus 1 Cor. iii. 8. quemlibet τὸν τοῦ ἰδίου μισθοῦ, mercedem peculiarem accepturum esse docet. In eo tamen cels. Heumanno nequeo assentiri, quum is vocem τόπος, pro munere per latinismum positam esse asserit. Sic enim Josephus l. 16. c. 11. p. 563. de Antipatro Herodis filio fratribus insidiante dicit, αὐτὸς δὲ πολλὰς ἀπολοφύμεναι τόποι λαμβάνειν, illum sæpe defensoris partes in se suscepisse. Epictetus in enchirid. c. 54. Ἀβστὶ ἰλὺδ ἐπὶ αὐτὸν τὸν τοῦ ἰδίου τόπον, οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος τόπος, sed et hoc loco lapsus in plebeium morem. Frequentius tamen vox χώρα hoc sensu adhibetur. Arrianus Dissert. Epict. l. 3. c. 24. p. 333. τίταξαι ἐν πολλῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ καὶ καὶ ἐν ταπεινῇ τῇ τῇ χώρᾳ; ἀλλ' αἰβουλεύεις, magnus tibi principatus attributus est, et locus minime humilis, tu perpetuus senator es. Ibid. p. 341. Virum sapientem in eo solo elaborare dicit, πὼς τὴν αὐτῆς χώραν ἐκπληρώσῃ, quomodo stationem suam impleat decenter, et deo obediendo. Vide dicenda ad 1 Cor. 14. 16. et Elmsnerum ad istum locum.

Kypke Observationes sacræ, &c. tom. ii. p. 9, 10.

was to succeed him; and that the infinitive, *to go*, πορεύεσθαι, rendered *that he may go*, is governed of the verb, λαβειν, *take*; and that τοποι ιδιοι, *his proper office*, means the office of an apostle.

In like sort, where St. Paul says, 1 Cor. xiv. 16, *how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say, Amen, at the giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?* should rather be rendered—*how shall he*, ο αναπληρων του τοπου τε ιδιωτε, *that fills the office of a private person*, (which was that of a hearer only, who was to profit by and give his assent to what he heard,) *say, Amen, &c.*

The *mansions* or *places* therefore promised to the apostles, being the different departments and offices which they were destined to fill in propagating the divine truth of the gospel through the world; we may thus give our Lord's words more at large, so far as we have explained them.

*In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so, I should have told you.* i. e. “ You may rely upon  
 “ what I have often told you, of the important part  
 “ and office to which I have chosen you, and for  
 “ which I have been training and fitting you, all the  
 “ time I have been with you. My heavenly Father  
 “ has a large church and family to be collected out  
 “ of all nations, who by believing and obeying my  
 “ gospel, will become his true worshipers, and  
 “ attain eternal life. Be assured, therefore, that  
 “ there will not only be sufficient employment,  
 “ but also a divine support and assistance for you,  
 “ my apostles in particular, and for all who are  
 “ willing to join and labour in this great and heavenly work. I should not otherwise have raised  
 “ your hopes, or have given you a promise of your  
 “ acting a distinguished part under me in the spiritual kingdom of truth and righteousness which I  
 “ have begun to set up in this world; and of your  
 being



" being the chief instruments after me, in the hands  
 " of God, of spreading and establishing it.

" And be not disturbed at my going away from  
 " you. It will be for your advantage. *I go to pre-  
 " pare a place for you.* My departure will be the  
 " means of supplying you with powers and qualifi-  
 " cations for your office."

Our way will now be paved for the more easy in-  
 terpretation of what follows, viz. ver. 3. (n) *And  
 when I go to prepare a place for you, I will come  
 again.*—

We are next to examine, what our Lord intended,  
 by his *coming again* to his disciples.

It cannot be understood, as Dr. Clarke and others  
 have explained it; " when I have prepared a place  
 " for you in that eternal state, I will return again;"  
 because this coming again was to be the means of  
 fitting them for the better discharge of their duty  
 of preaching the gospel, in the present state: for,  
 this we have seen to be the place or office, which he  
 was to prepare and make ready for them.

It might, with greater ground of probability, be  
 explained of his coming again at his appearance to  
 them, after his resurrection, because he then actually  
 conversed with them about this their great office,  
 and instructed them in what related to it. But this  
 cannot be what is here intended; because those his

D 2

instructions

(n) In our English version, (a thing well-known and remarked  
 by expositors,) *εαν* is wrongly translated *if*, instead of *when*. As  
*και*, is also omitted in the Alexandrian and very many other M.SS.  
 and *ετοιμασω* is *ετοιμασαι* in many M.SS. it is probable the  
 evangelist wrote, *Πορευομαι ετοιμασαι τοπον υμιν. Και εαν παρευθω  
 ετοιμασαι υμιν τοπον &c.* this reading therefore is followed, for  
 accuracy's sake, though the sense is much the same. Wetstein  
 omits the *και*, and very strangely reads *εαν παρευθω, ετοιμασω*.

instructions to them, however necessary, were by no means a sufficient and effectual qualification of them for preaching the gospel, which is represented as the business of his coming again here mentioned.

We shall find our Lord himself solving the difficulty to us a little after. For, ver. 15—18. resum- ing the subject with which he had set out, after some little interruption by the questions his disciples had put to him, and premising the necessary condition of a sincere obedience, without which they could expect no countenance from him, nor favour from Almighty God, he says; *If ye love me, keep my commandments. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; the spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you.*

That which our Lord here styles *another comforter*, but which might better be rendered, *another advocate*, whom he tells them he would pray the Father to send in his name, to supply his place, was unquestionably those gifts of the holy spirit, i. e. of a divine extraordinary power, which were afterwards bestowed upon them; by which they were enabled to teach and propagate the gospel with effect, throughout the world. And he speaks of this assistance to be given them; in his usual, lively, figurative stile, as of a person that was to be always with them, and ready to plead their cause and to help them.

Moreover, this promise of a divine assistance in their great work, is mentioned in such connection with *his coming* to them, as to induce us to look upon them as one and the same thing: *his coming*, not

not in (o) person, but in the gifts of the holy Spirit, which would be sent them in his name, to forward and accomplish what he had begun. And he represents it as his own coming again to them, [*I will not leave you comfortless, — rather orphans, (destitute, without help) I will come to you:*] because it would be in effect the same, and answer the same purposes, as if he in person were to be with them, to advise and help them.

So that according to Christ's explanation of his own words, his *coming again* to these his chosen disciples, and *abiding* with them, was not *his coming* to them in person, but in the performance of his promise made to them of the heavenly Father's sending them such extraordinary powers, as would be every thing to them that he himself could be, if he were present with them, and would enable them to spread the divine truth of the gospel with success among the nations of the earth.

We pass on therefore to consider how the remaining part of this sentence is to be taken, viz. *I will [come again and] receive you to myself, that where I am, there ye may be also.*

This

(o) Dr. Lightfoot understands the passage before us in the usual manner: yet saw it necessary to interpret the coming of Christ in the way here pointed out, in order to explain another part of this farewell discourse of our Lord's.

“ John xvi. ver. 16. *A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father. Ye shall not see me personally, but virtually.* “ It is true they did not see him when he lay in the grave, and they did see him when he rose again; but I question whether these words ought to be taken in this sense, because it would sound somewhat harshly where it is added, *ye shall see me, because I go unto the Father.* I would therefore rather understand it of his ascending into heaven, *after which they saw him indeed no more personally, but they did see him in the influences and gifts of his holy Spirit* ” —

Lightfoot, vol. ii. p. 606.



This last clause has been generally understood as a promise of Christ to his apostles, to be fulfilled at the resurrection at the last day, when he would see them again, and they were to be ever with him. But we may be assured that this, however true, is by no means the thing intended here. For we have seen, from our Lord's own explanation, that his coming again, at which time he was to receive them to himself, was not a thing at such a vast distance, but implied the doing something for them very soon, according to his promise, to qualify them to be able preachers of the gospel, after his removal from them.

Therefore, this *receiving them to himself*, and *their being with him wherever he should be*, being in immediate connection with these, their new powers and abilities of preaching and propagating the gospel, necessarily refers us to them. And, as our Lord's stile is all along highly figurative, yet of great simplicity, his words, in this view, naturally present themselves to us, as importing, that they, his disciples, should be fellow-labourers with him, his associates, whom in that sense *he would receive to himself*, and they *should be with him where he should be*, by occupying the same station in which he had been, being employed in the same work, in carrying on the great design of Almighty God, to bring a sinful degenerate world to virtue and a blessed immortality.

We shall find this interpretation confirmed, by attending to our Lord's use of the same phrases, in two other places.

1. The first is, John xvi. 26. where, having spoken of himself being soon to suffer death, in the cause of the divine truth which he taught, and of the like dangers to which his sincere followers, in that first age of the gospel, would be exposed; he says,

says, *If any man serve me, let him follow me: i. e.* "whoever will be my faithful disciple, must prepare himself to follow me, in the same rugged road that I have gone in before him:" and *where I am, there also shall my servant be;* i. e. "he must expect to be my companion in all things, to share with me in the same labours and sufferings;" which are the things of which he had been speaking.

This interpretation is adopted by Calvin, and other commentators of the best note; that Christ's words, of his disciples *being with him where he should be*, are not a promise to them of any thing hereafter, but a continuance of the same exhortation of what his followers were to meet with in the present state.

2. The other passage is in his divine prayer, offered up to God at the close of this his farewell discourse to his apostles, and while they were present with him,

Having preferred his devout requests for himself, and for them also in particular, he afterwards turns himself to pray for all true believers, his followers, every where; *that, says he, as Thou, O Father, art in me, and I in Thee, they also may be (p) one in us:* i. e. that they may all be united as we are, and cooperate with us, in the same work of instructing and leading mankind in the way to eternal life.

He then proceeds to say, ver. 22. *And the glory which Thou hast given me, I have given them.*

Christ's glory, throughout this his prayer, which he often mentions with ardent desires for it, and which he here speaks of his disciples sharing with him, was not, as many have mistaken, any honour and dignity, which he had possessed before with the Father,

(p) N. B. True christians are one with God, in the same sense in which Christ was one with God.

Father, and (q) to which he was solicitous to be restored; but the success of his gospel among mankind upon earth, in forwarding their virtue and everlasting happiness.

This glory, he here says, *the heavenly Father had given him*, i. e. given him an assured promise of it. And the same, he adds, *he had given* to all his true followers, i. e. *given* it them by promise, assured them of a certainty of success, as an encouragement to their labours.

Soon after which it follows:

*O Father, I desire that they also whom Thou hast given me, MAY BE WITH ME WHERE I AM: that they may behold my glory which Thou hast given me.*  
i. e. "O thou author of my being, and of all things I enjoy and hope for, I pray that all my true followers may be heartily joined and united in this great work with me, for promoting the salvation of men, in which Thou hast first employed me; to carry it on as I have begun, to its accomplishment."

The connection of the words shews that this is the right interpretation of them. And besides, every one must easily perceive here, that one of such perfect virtue as our Lord, could never ask of God in prayer, could never have any gratification in the thought of his disciples being spectators of his own personal glory and advancement in the heavenly world. He was void of all such private selfish views. In this sense, he said, on a certain occasion

(John

(q) It is to be hoped, that in no long time, this plain and just account of the glory which Christ prays for, will open the eyes of christians to see, that he does not desire any thing that he himself had enjoyed in a former state, but only what the almighty Father had destined and fore-ordained for him in this, when he makes his supplication for it, in those well-known words: *And now, O Father, glorify Thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.* John xvii. 5.  
See 1 Peter i. 20.



(John viii. 50.) and truly said, that *he sought not his own glory*. But he makes it his last request to God, and it was worthy of his most consummate excellent character; that others might *be with him where he was*, i.e. might be associated with him in the benevolent work in which he had been employed, and share with him in his labours for us; and that they might behold *his glory which the Father had given him*; i.e. might see the blessed effects of his labours, and of that doctrine which he had delivered to men; and by being made partakers of like divine gifts and powers, might be successful preachers and propagators of that holy truth, of which God had made him the original teacher, and his chief and most honoured instrument. (John viii. 50.) and *our Lord Jesus said to him*. Thus we have found, from our Lord's own explanation of the passage before us, and from his use of the like phrases at other times, that his going and preparing a place for his apostles, and coming again to them, was the fulfilment of his promise made to them in the extraordinary divine gifts and powers to be bestowed upon them by the heavenly Father, to qualify them for their great office to which he had appointed them; which in its beneficial consequences, would be the same as himself coming in person to them: *And his receiving them at the same time unto himself, that where he should be, there they might be also*, had no relation to their being with him in another world; but implied their union and cooperation with him in this, in bringing mankind out of darkness, (1 Pet. ii. 9) into the marvellous light of the gospel, according to the plan which himself had laid down, and begun in part; since in their so doing, they might be considered, and he should consider

E

them, as parts as it were of himself, and as if he were actually with them.

It is proper, and may be useful to remark and to point out, that the explanation now given of this first part of our Lord's farewell discourse to his apostles, is corroborated by what follows very soon after; where, upon the repeated mention of the conditions on which alone this divine assistance, and support of the holy Spirit would be conferred upon them, he says, ver. 21, 22, 23. *He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him. Judas saith unto him, (not Iscariot) Lord, how is it that Thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered and said unto him; if a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.*

In this that Christ here speaks, of manifesting himself, and of his and the heavenly Father's coming to his true and obedient disciples and making their abode with them, he continues the allusion with which he had at first begun, of the resemblance there was between God's residing in his house, the Jewish temple, and in his new and better house or temple, the family of true believers, the christian church; and signifies, that as God had formerly dwelt in the tabernacle, and temple, by sensible manifestations of his presence and protection: so now the heavenly Father, and himself together with him, would visit and come to his faithful followers, in the gifts of the holy Spirit, and power of God to be granted to them, as they had occasion and demand for them.

Christ

Christ is here said to *manifest himself*; God and Christ together, to *come unto* and *take up their abode* with the true and sincere christian. How was this done? not in person, (r) but in the gifts of a divine power, supplying the place of God and Christ, answering all the ends of their being personally present. And Christ is ranked with God, as concerned therein, because almighty God had made a promise by him of ending those divine aids, and Christ had foretold the same to his disciples: so that our Lord was interested in it, and as it were a party to it; and might be said to come to his faithful followers in this performance of his promise to them, and in its fulfilling all the ends of his personal residence among them.

#### COROLLARIES.

1. It has appeared, that by Christ's *coming again* to his disciples, after having prepared a place for them, was not intended any personal agency and appearance to them after his resurrection and ascension into heaven, but the extraordinary power of the heavenly Father accompanying them in their ministrations, in fulfilment of Christ's promise to them.

This will throw light on other sayings and promises of our Lord to his disciples; that they are not

#### E 2

(\*) As those epistles to the churches of Asia, in the former part of *The Revelation of St. John*, are generally supposed to be addressed to them in the apostolic age, whilst extraordinary miraculous powers were bestowed upon believers; from the explanation here given, of Christ's coming, we shall be enabled easily to see the meaning of the following highly figurative passage: *Behold, I stand at the door, and knock. If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me.* Rev. iii. 20.



to be understood of his acting himself in person after he was gone from them, but of the power of God accomplishing his words.

Thus ver. 13, 14. of this chapter, he says, *Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.*

The things that Christ here speaks of, as what they were to ask the Father in his name, and would be most assuredly granted to the prayers of his disciples, are such only as were necessary to promote the success of the gospel. This appears from chap. xv. 16. and xvi. 23. But then, though he here says of such requests, *If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it*; all that he intended thereby was, that God would do it for them according to his promise. For, ch. xvi. 23, 24. speaking of the very same things, he himself explains the matter, that he would be so understood: *And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you: Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name: ask, and receive, that your joy may be full.*

2. The apostle Peter, speaking of Jesus Christ, in a discourse to his countrymen, soon after his resurrection, acquaints them, that they must none of them expect to see him again on earth; for that (Acts iii. 21.) *the heaven would receive him, till the time of the restitution of all things.* It follows from this, and from what has been above explained, that if the scriptures speak of any agency of Christ now that he is in heaven, it is either the extraordinary power which was given in the apostles times, for the support of the gospel, in its feeble infant state; or else,

else, it is to be understood of the doctrines and powerful motives of the gospel, and their effect upon mankind, which in a figurative and not unusual sense, may be called Christ himself. This is what St. Paul means, when he says, Eph. iv. 20. *But ye have not so learned Christ*; and Philip. iv. 13. *I can do all things, through Christ, which strengtheneth me.*

3. In the course of our inquiry we have seen, that Christ assured his disciples that the heavenly Father of him and of all, would send another advocate and assistant to them, to supply his place, the spirit of truth, the holy Spirit, to remain with them, and to support them through all their difficulties in preaching the gospel. In the book called *The Acts*, where we have an account of the accomplishment of this promise of Christ on the part of almighty God, we find that this advocate, this holy Spirit, was not another divine person, but extraordinary divine gifts and powers, given to help them, by a very usual figure of speech represented as a person acting and assisting them.

These gifts and powers of the Spirit of God, were not confined to the apostles, but bestowed on other christians also at that time, who received them by their ministry. But as the promise of such a divine extraordinary assistance was made to the apostles only, we have no ground to extend it beyond their times: nor any authority to expect it. If any would maintain that such miraculous powers were continued beyond that period, the truth of the fact must depend upon the evidence he produces for it.

4. Although there is now *no holy Spirit*, (Acts xix. 2.) i. e. *no extraordinary* divine assistances afforded to christians, yet we are not left destitute of the aids of the Spirit of God. For we have still the directions of the Spirit in the precepts and instructions of

of Jesus Christ, (to whom God gave the Spirit without measure, John iii. 34.) which were delivered by him to his apostles, from whom we have received them. So that whilst we follow what Christ taught, and his apostles have written down and transmitted to us, we follow the guidance and leading of the holy Spirit of God. And from hence also it is evident, that whatever persons of warm imaginations may suppose, no one can say that he has the Spirit of God, and is guided by it, unless so far as his life and actions correspond with those holy rules and commandments delivered by Christ and his apostles.

5. The apostles of Christ had their peculiar *mansions in our Father's house*, the church of the living God here upon earth; stations and employments in it, the most difficult and dangerous. But they also had extraordinary helps and assistances, to qualify them for their great work of bringing a dark and sinful world to the knowledge of the true God, and to the attainment of eternal life. And they acquitted themselves gloriously in their day, all of them, of whom we have any records remaining.

We have all of us, in various degrees, the same work assigned us, which belonged to apostles; different mansions and stations in our Father's house here on earth, whereby we have it in our power to promote the gospel, and forward the virtue and final happiness of others and our own. And the meanest christian's work and efforts are as much wanted, and as necessary to carry on the plan of divine Providence, and the salvation of mankind by the gospel, as those of the apostles.

SOSIPATER.

A NEW



# A NEW TRANSLATION OF ISAIAH,

LII. 13—LIII. 12, WITH NOTES.

THE translation of Isaiah by Dr. Lowth, bishop of London, and his notes and preliminary dissertation, have great merit; the plan of the work is excellent; and many passages, before obscure, if not unintelligible, have been set in a clear light by his emendations of the text, and his corrections of the English version. But though much be done by this very learned and ingenious writer, yet I am confident, that great improvements may still be made, as well in translating, as in explaining, the writings of this evangelical prophet. The bishop is particularly defective in one point, which appears to me to be of singular importance, I mean in respect to the passages cited in the New Testament from the prophet. Several of these passages, as they stand in his version, are essentially different from the citations. St. Paul in Rom. xv. 21, intended to cite the two last lines of the fifty-second chapter of Isaiah; but, if the bishop's version be just, the original conveys a very different meaning from the citation. In like manner three lines of Isaiah liii. 8, are understood to be cited in Acts viii. 33; but two of these lines in the bishop's version are TOTALLY different from the citation. In neither of these instances doth he attempt to reconcile the difference, or to account for it. It appears

appears to me in the highest degree probable; that in both instances there was a perfect agreement between the original and the citation; and that the difference was occasioned by the corruption of the original, either by accident or design. I may add, that if the two first lines of Isaiah liii. 4, which are cited in Matt. viii. 17, as being fulfilled in the cures performed by our Saviour on certain diseased persons, be rightly translated by the bishop, they are strangely misapplied (s) by the evangelist. But the mistake is certainly in the translation, and not in the application. It may perhaps be found, that in other respects the learned author fails materially in his explication of the passage of Isaiah here considered.

This passage of Isaiah is one of the most celebrated prophecies in the Old Testament; and though there be great reason to believe, that the ancient Jews wilfully (t) corrupted several parts of it, yet by comparing

(s) See bishop Pearce's Commentary on St. Matthew. This learned writer, merely on account of the supposed misapplication of the prophecy, conjectures, that Matt. viii. 17, may be an interpolation. Dr. Sykes, in his Essay on the Truth of the Christian Religion, p. 232, 233. 2d. edit. takes another method, and, presuming the English version to be right, affirms it to be "certain, that the words cited Matt. viii. 16, 17, are nothing but mere accommodation of the phrase of Isaiah to the present occasion: — because, saith he, we find them applied by St. Peter in his 1 Ep. chap. ii. 24, to a quite different purpose, viz. to Jesus's bearing our sins upon the cross." But the reason here given by this learned writer is founded in mistake. St. Peter doth not so apply the words of Isaiah liii. 49 but certainly cites Isaiah liii. 12, where the words of the LXX are, *αὐτὸς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνελάμβανεν*. And the apostle may perhaps allude to Isaiah liii. 6. The word *αμαρτίας* now found, instead of *αὐθιρίας*, in the version of the LXX is a great corruption. See Dr. Kennicott's Diff. Gen. Sect. 79.

(t) See Kennicott. Diff. Gen. Sect. 69, 70, 79.

comparing the original and the ancient versions together, and by the assistance afforded by the MSS. whose variations are published in Dr. Kennicott's noble edition of the Hebrew bible, most of the corruptions may be discovered and corrected. The prophecy is understood by Christians in general as containing a circumstantial description of the sufferings and death of the Messiah. But by not rightly distinguishing the speakers in it, and by not sufficiently attending to the form and manner of the composition, much of it's beauty hath been lost. It is most clear, that the three last verses of the fifty-second chapter are the words of God himself declaring, " That though his servant, the Messiah, would be despised and rejected by many on account of the meanness of his appearance, yet he would be very successful in his endeavours to reform the world, and many nations, and even kings, would attend to him." Hereupon the prophet, AS HAVING LIVED IN THE TIME OF THE MESSIAH, AND HAVING HIMSELF OBSERVED HIS PROGRESS (u), exclaims,

O JEHOVAH ! Who hath believed our report ;  
And to whom hath the arm of JEHOVAH been manifested ?

In which words he refers to the foregoing prophecy uttered by him in the name of God, and laments the little success, which, at that time, had attended the

(u) An observation made by Bishop Lowth in his *Prælectiones de sacra Poësi Hebræorum*, a work which hath done honour, not to him only, but also to his country, is so applicable here, that I cannot forbear to transcribe it. " Moyses, saith he, cœlesti mentis instinctu prospiciens nefariam illam Divini cultus derelictionem, in quam mox conjuratura erat perfida Israelitarum natio, ita eorum crimina infectatur. QUASI SE PRÆSENTE ET INSPECTANTE jam antea commissa ;

" Cor.



the preaching of the Messiah: and he then proceeds to describe, AS FROM HIS OWN OBSERVATION, the meanness of his appearance, the manner in which the Jewish nation received him, the miraculous cures performed by him, his sufferings and death, and his burial in the sepulchre of a rich man; and in many parts of this description he remarkably includes himself, using frequently the words *we, us* and *our*; and in one part he calls the Jewish nation in the time of Christ *his own people*. "Through the wickedness, saith he, of my people he was smitten to death." The prophet having thus described the Messiah as dead and deposited in a sepulchre, God is represented, as declaring in his own words, "That though the enemies of his servant, the Messiah, had prevailed so far as to put him to death, yet, as he had suffered death in the cause of truth and virtue, he should be raised from the dead to an immortal life, and by his instructions, and by his means, a great reformation

"Corrupti illi Filios, non jam suos, ipsorum pravitas :  
 "Ita loquitur QUASI IPSE TESTIS ESSET eorum Impietatis, et  
 "nefandis illis sacris, quibus Religionem a se divinitus institu-  
 "tam aliquando violaturi erant, INTERFUISSET. Qua anti-  
 "cipatione nihil potest esse efficacius ad res clare et evidenter  
 "demonstrandas, et pene sub aspectum subjiciendas: adeoque  
 "in Poesi Prophetica sæpissime locum habet. In hoc ut in cæ-  
 "teris admirabilis est Isaias: attendite modo quam clare exposuit  
 "iter Senacharibi adversus Hierosolymam, variasque exercitus  
 "stationes; UTQUE RERUM GERENDARUM PRÆDICTIONI EAM  
 "EVIDENTIAM ET LUCEM INTULIT VATES, QUAM IN GESTA-  
 "RUM NARRATIONE VIX CONSEQUI POTUISSET HISTORICUS."  
 (Isai. x. 28—32) Prælect. xv. As to the line here cited from  
 Deut. xxxii. 5, it is rightly observed by Bishop Lowth in a  
 note added in the second edition of his *Prælectiones*, and by Dr.  
 Kennicott in his *Diff. Gen. Sect. 72*, that it is incorrect, and  
 ought to be amended agreeably to the Samaritan Pentateuc.  
 Dr. Kennicott would then translate it thus; "*Corrupti sunt, non  
 sunt ejus, Filii Maculae.*"

tion would be effected in the world, much to his own satisfaction, and to the everlasting advantage of many of the human race."

Thus understood the prophecy is freed from that confusion of persons, which is observed in the common explications of it, and is clear and consistent in all it's parts. But as the interpretation here given is new in many respects, it is submitted with diffidence to the judgment and candour of the reader.

It will be found, on comparing the translation here given with the English bible, that many improvements are adopted in it, of which no notice is taken in the notes subjoined; and in regard to them the reader is requested to consult the translation and notes of Bishop Lowth.

III. 1. O JEHOVAH, WHO HAST BEEN MIGHTY, AND TO WHOM HAST THE ARM OF JEHOVAH BEEN MADE KNOWN; FOR HE GIVETH UP IN HIS RIGHT AS A REDEEMER; AS A ROOT FROM A DRY PLACE; HE HAD NO FORM, NOR ANY BEAUTY, THAT WE SHOULD DESIRE HIM; DESPISED, NOT ACCOUNTED IN THE NUMBER OF MEN; A MAN OF SORROWS, AND ACCQUAINTED WITH GRIEF; AND AS ONE WHO HID HIS FACE FROM US, HE WAS DESPISED, AND WE ESTEEMED HIM NOT. 4. Surely our iniquities he took away, And our secret sins, he removed them; Yet we thought him chastised, and afflicted; But he was wounded for our transgressions; We as sinners for our iniquities: The discipline, by which our peace is effected, was on him; And by his bruises we are healed.

ISAIAH 53. 1. 2.

6. We

## ISAIAH LII. 13.—LIII. 12.

- LII. 13. BEHOLD, my servant shall prosper ;  
 He shall be raised aloft, and magnified, and very  
 highly exalted.  
 14. As many will be astonished at him ;  
 (To such a degree will his countenance be disfigured,  
 more than that of man ;  
 And his form more than that of the sons of men ;)  
 15. So shall many nations look on him with admiration ;  
 Even kings shall shut their mouths.  
 For they to whom nothing hath been told concerning  
 him, shall see ;  
 And they who have not heard, shall understand.

- LIII. 1. O JEHOVAH ! Who hath believed our report ;  
 And to whom hath the arm of JEHOVAH been mani-  
 fested ?  
 2. For he grew up in his sight as a tender sucker ;  
 And as a root from a thirsty soil :  
 He had no form, nor any beauty, that we should re-  
 gard him ;  
 Nor was his countenance such, that we should desire  
 him.  
 3. Despised, nor accounted in the number of men ;  
 A man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief ;  
 And as one who hid his face from us.  
 He was despised, and we esteemed him not.  
 4. Surely our infirmities he took away ;  
 And our sicknesses, he removed them :  
 Yet we thought him judicially stricken ;  
 Smitten of God, and afflicted.  
 5. But he was wounded for our transgressions ;  
 Was smitten for our iniquities :  
 The discipline, by which our peace is effected, was  
 on him ;  
 And by his bruises we are healed.

6. We



6. We all of us as sheep have strayed ;  
 We have turned aside, every one to his own way ;  
 And Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquities of us all.
7. He was brought forth ; and being required to answer,  
 he opened not his mouth.  
 As a lamb he was led to the slaughter,  
 And as a sheep before her shearer,  
 Is dumb ; so he opened not his mouth.
8. In his humiliation his condemnation was extorted :  
 And the men of his generation who will be able to  
 describe ?  
 For his life was cut off from the earth ;  
 Through the wickedness of my people he was smitten  
 to death.
9. And he was placed with wicked men at his death ;  
 And with a rich man is his sepulchre.  
 Although he had done no wrong ;  
 Neither was guile found in his mouth ;
10. Yet it pleased JEHOVAH to crush him with affliction.

- SINCE he is made an offering for sin,  
 He shall see a seed, and shall prolong his days,  
 And the gracious purpose of JEHOVAH shall prosper in  
 his hands.
11. Of his labour he shall see [the fruit], and be satisfied.  
 By his knowledge shall my servant turn many to  
 righteousness ;  
 And their iniquities he shall bear away.
12. Therefore will I distribute to him the many for his  
 portion ;  
 And the mighty shall he share as a spoil.  
 Because he gave up himself to death ;  
 And was numbered with transgressors :  
 And he took away the sins of many ;  
 And made intercession for transgressors.

## NOTES.

## C H A P. LII.

14. — will be astonished at him;  
(To such a degree will his countenance be disfigured,  
more than that of man;

And his form more than that of the sons of men;)]

It seems to me, that the verbs in this verse ought to be translated in the future tense, as they are in the 13th verse, and as they are in this verse by the LXX. The same Hebrew word *וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה* in Ezek. xxvi. 35. and xxviii. 19. is rightly rendered *shall be astonished*. Besides other authorities for reading *וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה* (at him) for *וְיִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה* (at thee), Bishop Lowth observes, that the Vulgate in a MS. reads so. Dr. Kennicott, in his most valuable *Dissertatio Generalis* at the end of his Hebrew bible p. 35. n. 2, specifies ten Latin MSS. which read *super eum*. And I have two Latin MSS. in which the same reading is preserved.

15. So shall many nations look on him with admiration.] Dr. Durell and Dr. Jubb follow the reading of the LXX, *ὁπότε πολλοὶ ἔθνη*; and, as I think, rightly. See Bp. Lowth's note.

Ibid. Even kings —] I add the conjunction *et* from the LXX, *καὶ βασιλεῖς*. All the material alterations made by me in Bishop Lowth's translation of this and the preceding verse are confirmed by Coverdale's version printed in 1550. "Lyke as the multitude shal wondre upon him; because his face shal be so deformed, and not as a man's face, and his beutie lyke no man: Even so shal the multitude of the Gentiles LOKE UNTO HYM; AND the kynges shal shut their mouthes before him." The reader will also observe, that this old edition agrees with the MSS. of the Vulgate, which read *super eum*, and which are confirmed by two Hebrew MSS. See Dr. Kennicott, *Diff. Gen.* p. 45. n. 3.

Ibid.

Ibid. For they to whom nothing hath been told concern-  
ing him, shall see;

And they who have not heard, shall understand.]

St. Paul, Rom. xv. 21, cites this part of the verse ex-  
actly as it is in the LXX, and as it is cited by Justin in  
his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, p. 161. edit. Thirlby,  
and by Origen c. Celsus, Lib. i. p. 41, 42. edit. Spencer.

Origen understood the Hebrew language well, carefully  
compared the version of the LXX with the original, and  
expressly asserts, that in his disputes with the Jews he  
cited from the LXX such passages only as agreed with  
the Hebrew. See Dr. Kennicott's note on Isai. liii. 8.

in Bishop Lowth, and his Diff. Gen. Sect. 69. I think

therefore that we ought to correct the Hebrew in this  
instance by the LXX, especially as a slight alteration only  
is necessary. Bishop Lowth's translation, as well as the

common English bible, is essentially different from St.

Paul's citation. Coverdale's version in 1550 is remark-

able. "For they that have not bene tolde of him shall

see him: and they that herde nothings of hym shall be-

holde him."

Now we know which of the two is the original.

It is the LXX, and the Hebrew is corrected.

C H A P. LIII.

THE O JEHOVAH! Who hath believed — ] The

word *אשר* seems to have been lost from the beginning of

this verse. It is in all the copies of the LXX, is twice cited

in the New Testament John xii. 38. and Rom. xi. 16, and

is in Clemens Ro. c. 16, Justin in many places p. 73, 161,

221, 380, 390, and in Origen c. Celsus p. 42, 327. The

omission in the Hebrew was probably occasioned by the

word being expressed by the first letter only, or by that

letter with a little stroke after it. Dr. Kennicott in his

Diff. Gen. Sect. 25. hath given many examples of mistakes

from this cause; and it is, as he remarks, an observation

which may be of great use. To the examples collected

by that learned writer I will add two others. In

Isai. xlii. 19. at the end of the verse it is *אשר עבדך*, as the

servant of JEHOVAH; but Symmachus hath *אשר עבדך*,

as my servant, reading *אשר עבדך*, as one MS. now reads.

See Cappel. Critic. Sac. 249. The other example

which



which I shall give is Amos ix. 26; and it is of great importance. The Aldine edition of the LXX reads, "That the residue of men may seek ME;" but the Alexandrian MS. for *me* reads THE LORD, agreeably to the citation by St. James in Acts xv. 17. The Vatican MS. hath neither of these readings, and is manifestly defective, the verb having no object. In the present Hebrew it is only *me*, but the true reading is *me* *me*, which having been written contractedly occasioned the wrong version in the Aldine edition of the LXX. See on this verse in Amos Dr. Owen's Inquiry into the Present State of the Septuagint Version, p. 68, 84. and Dr. Kennicott's Diss. Gen. Sect. 67, 77, 81, who have made other important corrections in it.

2. — he grew up — ] The English version is, *he will grow up*, and Bishop Lowth's, *he groweth up*, but the true translation is, *he grew up*, the future verb being changed into a præterit, by the converseive *vau* joined to it. As to which rule of grammar, see Peters on Job p. 202. first edition; p. 198, second edition. The versions of Aquila and Theodotio are in the future; but Symmachus hath *ame*. The word which we now have in the LXX, *amgghamur*, is nonsense in this place.

Ibid. — in his sight — ] In Bishop Lowth's version it is, in *their* sight; but the original is *me*, and the version of the LXX is agreeable thereto, *amam* ATTOT, and this reading is confirmed by other authorities. The Bishop cites no authority in support of the reading followed by him, *me*.

4. — he took away. ] Bishop Lowth's version is, *he hath borne*. But it hath been most satisfactorily proved by many learned men, that *me* here, as in many other places, is to be understood in the sense of *taking away*. See Whiston's Boyle's Lectures p. 19 &c. 162, Dr. Taylor's Key, No. 162, On Atonement p. 26, &c. and Dr. Kennicott's Diss. Gen. Sect. 79. and p. 45. n. 2. Coverdale's version in 1550 is, "He onely TAKETH AWAY" "oure infirmite."

Ibid. — our sicknesses — ] The Bishop's version is, *our sorrows*; and Dr. Kennicott in his Diss. Gen. Sect. 79. seems to contend, that the Hebrew word *me*, and the Greek word *me*, by which it is expressed in

Matt.

Matt. viii. 17, signify only the diseases of the mind; but it is certain, that they also signify bodily disorders. As to the former, see Dr. Taylor's Concord. R. 280, and as to the latter, see Matt. iv. 24. Luke vi. 17. vii. 21, and Mr. Farmer's most excellent Essay on the Demoniacs of the New Testament, p. 64, &c. 177, 178. The word *Languores* in the old Latin version preserved by Tertullian, and cited from him by Dr. Kennicott, signifies bodily disorders. See Tertullian, p. 407, 418.

Ibid. — he removed them — ] The Bishop's version is, *he hath carried them*. But it hath been also proved by many learned men, that the word *בָּרָא* is here used in the sense of *removing*, or *bearing away*. See Crellius. Responsio ad Grotium de satisfactione Christi. p. 56. Whiston's Boyle's Lectures, p. 19, &c. 62. Dr. Taylor's Key, No. 162. On Atonement, p. 32. Dr. Kennicott indeed in his Diss. Gen. sect. 79, insists, that *בָּרָא*, and the Greek word *καραν* answering to it, signify here, *he carried*, not *he carried away*, and thinks that he is supported in his opinion by Tertullian, who makes use of the word *portat* in explaining these Hebrew and Greek words, and he expresseth some astonishment at the assertion of Grotius, that Tertullian understands *καραν* as signifying *abstulit*. But the assertion of Grotius is well founded; for Tertullian in the place cited by Dr. Kennicott hath the following observation, which this learned writer hath omitted to transcribe. "*Portare autem, faith he, Graeci etiam pro eo solent ponere, quod est TOLLERE.*" Lib. 4. adversus Marcion, p. 418. Coverdale's version is, "*and beareth our paine.*" But in the eleventh verse *בָּרָא* is understood by him as signifying to *BEAR AWAY*. As to the Greek words *καραν*, *καραν* and *αφεσεν*, see Dr. Taylor's Key, No. 162 at the end of the note.

5. The discipline — ] This is a more proper expression than that which is used in the English bible and is retained by Bishop Lowth, *the chastisement*. See Dr. Taylor's Key, No. 146. On the Lord's Supper, p. 51. And the word *discipline* is more agreeable to the version of the LXX, ΠΑΙΔΕΙΑ *paideia* *paedagogia*, which is followed by the Vulgate, *DISCIPLINA* *Pacis nostra super eum*. In Heb. xii. 5, 7, 8, 11, the word *מַדְרִיכָה* is *general*

veral times rendered *disciplina* in the Vulgate. And it is often used in the same sense by the best Greek writers.

6. ——— hath laid on him. ——— ] This seems to be a more proper version than Bishop Lowth's, *bath made to light upon him*; and it is more agreeable to the Vulgate, "et posuit Dominus in eo iniquitatem omnium nostrum." The sins of men are figuratively represented as laid on him in order to be borne or carried away. See Dr. Taylor's Key, No. 162. and Dr. Sykes on Heb. ix. 28. The version of the Lxx, as we now have it, is, *Kai Kopios paraforos avton tais anagrias hμων*, and *Jehovah hath delivered him for our sins*.

7. He was brought forth; and being required to answer, he opened not his mouth.]

This interpretation, which appears to be a great improvement, was communicated in conversation by my good friend Dr. Kennicott; and I have no doubt but that it will be fully justified in the notes on various passages in the Old Testament, which he had prepared for the press. In the mean time it may be right to observe, that the word *was*, here translated, *he was brought forth*, is, as Dr. Taylor in his Concordance saith, a forensic term, and signifies, *accedere jussus, adductus est*. See *Isai. xli. 1, 21. 1. 8. Deut. xxv. 1.* And Symmachus here renders it by the word *περονεχθη*. As to *my*, Buxtorf in his *Lexicon*, without taking notice of this passage, renders it, *exoratus respondere*. In one MS. the *in* *xy* is omitted, and Symmachus and Theodotio seem not to have had the *in* in their copies; for Wotton in a note on *Clemens R. c. 16.* represents them as reading, *παρὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον*, though, according to the London Polyglot, vol. 6, the reading of Symmachus be, *καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνθρωπου*.

*Ibid.* As a lamb he was led to the slaughter;

And as a sheep before her shearer.] The words *lamb* and *sheep* seem, as Le Clerc on *Acts viii. 32.* observes, to have changed places in the Lxx and in *Acts*. The order in the Hebrew is most proper. Bp. Lowth's translation is, *As a lamb that is led*, &c; but in the Lxx and *Acts* the word is *αγνος*, *he was led*. At the end of the second line the word is in the plural number; but two MSS. have it in the singular number agreeably to the Lxx and *Acts viii. 32.* See *Lactant. Epit. p. 126. n. 1. edit. Davis.* The prophet in this verse very remarkably



markably foretells our Saviour's silence on two different occasions, namely, before his judges, and at the time of his sufferings. His silence before his judges is related Matt. xxvi. 57—63. xxvii. 12—14. Mark xiv. 53—61. xv. 3—5. Luke xxiii. 9. John xix. 9. See Lardner's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 37, 44—50. As to his silence at the time of his sufferings, see Lardner, *ibid.* p. 57, &c.

8. In his humiliation, &c. — I have made many considerable alterations in Bishop Lowth's translation of this verse, the reasons for which shall be submitted to the judgment of the reader. 1st. I adopt the reading of the LXX, ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει, which is followed Acts viii. 33. In the Hebrew are the words כַּעַר וּמִשְׁפַּח, which in our version are rendered *from prison and from judgment*. Bishop Lowth hath no note on these words; but his version is, *by an oppressive judgment*. He would read, I presume, by mere conjecture, as Dr. Kennicott in his *Dist. Gen.* Sect. 28. n. h. proposeth, כַּעַר וּמִשְׁפַּח. But as the reading of the LXX and Acts gives a clear and good sense, is it not safer to correct the Hebrew on their authority, especially as they are in part confirmed by a Hebrew MS, which reads מִשְׁפַּח instead of כַּעַר וּמִשְׁפַּח? I must observe farther, that in Acts viii. 33, the reading is, ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ΑΥΤΟΥ, whereas the pronoun is not in the LXX, and is omitted in Acts by the Alexandrian MS. and the Vulgate: but this is of little consequence, the sense being the same with or without the pronoun. "Ταπεινωσις, saith Dr. Lightfoot on Luke i. 48, signifieth not the virtue of humility or the lowliness of mind, but the state of a low and poor condition, and it is so rendered here by the Syrian, Arabic, Spanish, French, Deodates, Italian, Dutch and all Latines that are not wedded to the Vulgar: and so it is used by the LXX Gen. xvi. 11, and xli. 52. 1 Sam. i. 11, and so again by the New Testament Acts viii. 33, compared with the original in *Isai.* liii. 8: and so Heathen authors distinguish betwixt ταπεινωσις and ταπεινοφροσυνη, by the former understanding as we do here, and by the latter the virtue of humility. The same word in a manner, or one of the same root in v. 52 is opposed to Δυνασις, and inevitably beareth the sense we follow." Works, vol. i. 414. See also Whitby on Luke i. 48.

2dly. I think on the authority of the LXX and Acts viii. 33, which read  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\iota\gamma\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\iota$ , and of the MS. above mentioned, which reads  $\text{שׁוֹמֵר}$ , that we ought to read  $\text{שׁוֹמֵר}$ , and translate it, *his condemnation*, as the words in both languages certainly signify. See Taylor's Concord. R. 2000. No. 97, and Bishop Lowth's note on xlii. 13, and as to  $\kappa\alpha\iota\sigma\iota\gamma\eta$ , see Matt. xxiii. 33. John iii. 17—19. v. 24, 27. and Wettstein on John v. 24 and 27.

3dly. I translate  $\text{קָרָה}$  and  $\text{קָרָה}$ , *was extorted*, which sense the connection requires, and the words will well bear, both of them signifying *to seize, to take by force, &c.* The manner in which the sentence of death against our Saviour was extorted from Pilate by the Jews, as it is related in the New Testament, is extremely remarkable; and it is here, I think, very clearly foretold. The circumstances of this affair contained in the gospels are collected together, and pertinent remarks are made thereon by Dr. Lardner in his Credib. part i. book i. c. 7. sec. 8. "It is evident, saith he, from the passages last quoted, and from many others in the Gospels, that the evangelists have represented Pilate's CONDEMNATION of our Lord as EXTORTED from him." See Acts iii. 13—15. xlii. 28, and Bishop Pearce thereon. It is right to add, that Bishop Pearce on Acts viii. 33, observes, that the words, "In his humiliation his judgment was taken away," seem to mean that the sentence given by Pilate for crucifying him (Christ) was FORCED from that judge, and that, according to him, the LXX seem to have read, in the Hebrew text,  $\text{בְּעֶזֶר נִשְׁמַר לֹדֶה}$ .

4thly. The words next following are thus rendered by Bishop Lowth, "And the manner of his life who would declare?" And in a note he hath given from Dr. Kennicott some very ingenious observations in support of this version, which hath been approved by many learned men. But though it be recommended by such very respectable authorities, yet I am satisfied, that this is not the true meaning of Isaiah; for the verbs in Hebrew and Greek ( $\text{יְדַבֵּר}$  and  $\text{διηγοῖται}$ ) signify *will declare*, and not *would declare*, and the words  $\text{דֹּר}$  and  $\text{τῆς γενεᾶς αὐτοῦ}$  signify, in their plain and obvious meaning, *his generation* or *his age*. The words  $\text{דֹּר}$  and  $\text{γενεα}$  occur very frequently in the sacred writings, and are

are almost always to be understood in the same sense. See Whitby on Matt. xxiv. 34. In Matt. xi. 16. our Saviour asks, "Whereunto shall I liken this generation, *ἡ ΓΕΝΕΑ ταύτη*?" Which question in Luke vii. 31, is thus expressed, "Whereunto shall I liken the men of this generation, *οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῆς ΓΕΝΕΑΣ ταύτης*?" What could be more proper than for the prophet to express indignation against such unexampled wickedness as that which he foretells; and how could he express indignation more properly than by such an exclamation? "I cannot say it without regret, saith Josephus De Bell. Jud. lib. v. c. 13. sect. 6. yet I must declare, it is my opinion, that if the Romans had delayed to come against these wretches, the city (Jerusalem) would have been swallowed up by an earthquake, or overwhelmed by a deluge, or else been consumed by fire from heaven, as Sodom was. For it bore a GENERATION OF MEN (ΓΕΝΕΑΝ) more wicked than those which had suffered such calamities." And in c. x. sect. 5. of the same book Josephus saith, "To reckon up all their villainies is impossible: but in a word, never did any city suffer so great calamities; nor was there ever from the beginning of the world a time [a generation of men, ΓΕΝΕΑΝ] more fruitful of wickedness than that was." As to the great corruption of the Jewish people about our Saviour's time, see Dr. Lardner's Credib. part. i. book i. c. 6, where these passages of Josephus are cited. I have copied his translation of them.

5thly. The next line I translate agreeably to the LXX and St. Luke, whose reading is probably more exact than the common reading: but it is of little consequence whether we follow the former or the latter reading, the meaning of both being nearly the same.

6thly. The beginning of the next line is thus translated by Bishop Lowth, "For the wickedness of my people." But the connection, I think, requires, that it should be translated, "THROUGH the wickedness of my people," as it certainly may be, (see Ps. cvii. 39.) and as it is by the LXX and in St. Luke, *ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν, &c.*; and in Tertullian adversus Judæos, p. 196, and Lactantius, Inst. Div. lib. iy. c. 18. A Facinoribus populi mei perductus [adductus. Lactant.] est ad mortem. By the words,



words, *my people*, I understand the prophet's people, as in Dan. ix. 20, 24. Jer. ix. 1. &c. and Ezek. xiii. 17; for from the beginning of this chapter the prophecy hath been uttered in the name of Isaiah, and not of God. Origen c. Cels. p. 41, 42, indeed understands the people of God to be meant, and supposeth some of the expressions used in the fourth and fifth verses to be uttered by persons of the Jewish and other nations, who had been benefited by the sufferings of Christ. But what confusion of persons is introduced by this interpretation! The reading of *מֵת*, *is death*, at the end of this verse is indisputably genuine. See Dr. Kennicott's note in Bishop Lowth's Isaiah, and his Diff. Gen. sect. 69, 77, 179, 176. Though Dr. Kennicott's translation of the two first lines of this verse be not adopted by Bishop Lowth, yet I have no doubt in preferring to the translation of the latter that of the former, which for the reasons offered by him, and by a learned foreign professor (Mr. Starck) cited by him appears to me to be in the highest degree probable. See his second Dissertation on the Hebrew Text. p. 369—374. Diff. Gen. sect. 69, 70. p. 30. n. Dr. Sykes in his Essay on the Truth of the Christian Religion. p. 256—260. 2d. edit. disapproves of the proposed transposition, and gives a very different translation. Let the reader weigh the arguments which have been offered by these learned writers. But it may not be improper to observe, that the connection favours Dr. Kennicott; and that such a transposition may now more easily be admitted, as it is established beyond the possibility of doubt, not only that many transpositions have been made in Hebrew MSS, but also that the Jews have wilfully corrupted several prophecies relating to the Messiah in the original and in the version of the LXX. See Dr. Owen's Inquiry into the present State of the Septuagint Version, and Dr. Kennicott's Diff. Gen. sect. 22, 23, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73. Dr. Kennicott's translation of the second line is, "And with a rich man was his sepulchre:" But I think that the prophet is to be understood as speaking in the time present, and describing the Messiah as then deposited in a sepulchre, and there remaining, till God himself, as in the next verse, declares his resolution

resolution to raise him from the dead. It is certain, that the words will admit this sense as well as the other, the exact translation being, "And with a rich man his sepulchre."

[Ibid. ——— was guile found ———] In the Alexandrian and other copies of the LXX, in Clemens R. c. 16. Justin. p. 75, 162. Origen c. Cels. p. 54. and 1 Pet. iii. 22, is the word *ψυχή*, and in Tertullian, p. 196, the words *inventus est*. It is therefore probable, that the word *ψυχή* hath been lost out of the text.

10. Since he is made an offering for sin.] The English version is, "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin," and Bishop Lowth's, "If his soul shall make a propitiatory sacrifice." But as our Saviour is before represented as put to death, these versions appear to be improper. The Bishop observes, that for *ψυχή* a MS. reads *ψυχήν*, which, saith he, may be taken passively, agreeably to some copies of the LXX, which have *ψυχήν*, and so reads the Syriac. In proof that *ψυχήν* is the true reading of the LXX, it may be observed, that Clemens R. c. 16. and Justin p. 75, read so. This reading is approved by Cappellus, Critic. Sac. 529, 530. It seems to me, that from this place to the end of the chapter God himself is represented as declaring the effects and the rewards of the conduct and sufferings of the Messiah, and that the true translation is, "Since he (*ψυχή*), his soul, being used here, and in the two following verses, as in many other places, instead of the pronoun; see Bishop Law's Appendix to his Considerations;) is made an offering for sin." That the particle *ὅτε*, and the correspondent Greek particles *ὅτι* and *ὡς*, which are similar to *ὅτε* here used by the LXX, frequently signify *quidam*; *quandoquidem* is fully proved in the books to which Mr. Farmer refers in his most ingenious Inquiry into the Nature and Design of Christ's Temptation in the Wilderness, p. 113, 14. 3d. edit. See Num. xxii. 20. Jer. xxiii. 38. Ezek. xxxv. 6. In the two last of which citations *ὅτε* is rendered *ATH* in the English bible. The version of Junius and Tremellius hath *quandoquidem* in this verse of Isaiah.

[Ibid. He shall see a seed ———] The meaning seems to be, "He shall see numerous converts to his religion;"

as the LXX is nearly to the same effect.

as in Ps. xlii, which, saith Mr. Peirce on Heb. ii. 12, "seems to belong entirely and solely to Christ; every thing in it fully agreeing to him, and some things in it being such as manifestly can relate to no other person;" Christ is represented at the thirtieth verse, according to the LXX and other ancient versions, and some Hebrew MSS, as saying, "MY SEED shall serve him, (Jehovah.)" See Dr. Randolph on the Prophecies and other texts cited in the New Testament, p. 49, &c. where the learned author hath made some curious remarks on the latter part of this psalm. See also Isai. viii. 18, and Peirce's Remarks thereon in his note on Heb. ii. 13.

Ibid. — and shall prolong his days.] Bishop Lowth's version is, "which [seed] shall prolong their days." But the more natural version is, *he shall prolong*, or, as one MS. reads, *and shall prolong*, ~~their~~, and ~~may~~ may as well be supposed to be corrupted from ~~his~~, *his days*, as from ~~their~~, *their days*. The Greek version, as we now have it, is *μακροζωον*, *he shall see a LONG-LIVED seed*, which doth not appear to be the true sense. The words seem to contain a promise, that the Messiah after being put to death should be restored to an endless life. So in Ps. xvi. 11, the Messiah in the state of the dead is introduced saying, "Thou wilt shew me the path of life." See also Ps. xciii. 16. "That Christ should rise again is implied, saith the most learned Mr. Mede; both in that famous prophecy of Esay liii. and that of Zachary xiii. In the former, forasmuch as it is said, that after he had made his soul a sacrifice for sin, he should see his seed, and prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord should prosper in his hands: and again, that the Lord should divide him a portion with the great, and that he should divide the spoil with the strong, because he had poured out his soul unto death: which argues that he should not only live again, but be victorious after he had died." Works, p. 349.

Ibid. — the gracious purpose of JEHOVAH. — In this book of Isaiah God is frequently represented as speaking of himself in the third person. See in particular chap. lviii. or elsewhere.



11. By his knowlege ———.] Bishop Lowth's version is, "By the knowlege of him;" and this version, according to Dr. Sykes, in his before cited Essay, p. 261, is right: but the other is the more natural sense of the word, and it must be so understood in Prov. iii. 20. The meaning here seems to be, that the precepts and doctrine of the Messiah would have a great effect in reforming mankind.

Ibid. — turn many to righteousness.] The word פְּרִי is so rendered by Dr. Taylor in his Concordance, R. 1568, as the word מְצַדִּיק is in Dan. xii. 3. Grotius understands the word here in the same manner.

Ibid. And their iniquities he shall bear away.] This is an exact translation of the original, and it is agreeable to the version of the LXX, *Kai tas amartias autōn autos airoi.* Coverdale's version in 1550 is thus, "For HE SHALL BEARE AWAY their synnes." The line is thus rendered by Bishop Lowth; "For THE PUNISHMENT of their iniquities HE SHALL BEAR." But this translation is exceedingly improper; for the verb, as it hath been before observed, signifies *to bear away*, and this line is manifestly parallel to the line preceding, and expresseth, in the usual manner of the Hebrew poets, the same sense in other words. The Bishop appears on this occasion, and indeed on many others, to have been misled by early prejudices, and an undue attachment to established systems.

12. Therefore will I distribute to him the many for his portion;

And the mighty shall he share as a spoil.] This is Bishop Lowth's translation, with some slight alterations; and it is perhaps the true meaning of the prophet. But it ought to be observed, that the LXX have translated the first line in the third person, *Διαικτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλὰς*, and that in their version the second line is thus, *Kai τῶν ισχυρῶν μερίν σκυλά.* Compare with this verse Philip. ii. 8—11.

Ibid. Because he gave up himself to death,] Bishop Lowth's version is, "Because he poured out his soul unto death." But I believe that I have given the exact sense of the original; and the Vulgate is accordingly, "Pro eo quod TRADIDIT in mortem animam suam." The version of the LXX is nearly to the same effect;

Αὐτὸς ὡς παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἢ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, *because his soul* (i. e. *he*) *was delivered to death*; and conformable to this version is the old Latin version preserved in Tertullian, p. 196, "Pro eo quod tradita est in mortem anima ejus." In Lactantius, Inst. Div. iv. 18, the expression is different, "Propterea quod TRADITUS EST ad mortem;" and it appears from this version, that *to deliver HIS SOUL to death*, and *to deliver HIMSELF to death*, are synonymous expressions. Our Saviour is said in many places of the New Testament, Gal. i. 4. ii. 20. Eph. v. 2. 1 Tim. ii. 6. and Tit. ii. 14. *to have given HIMSELF*; and in all these places the word αὐτοῦ, (*himself*,) is rendered in the Syriac version of the New Testament *his soul*. Coverdale's version in 1550 is wrong in translating the verb in the future tense; but he understands it as signifying *to give up*. His version is, "Because he shall GIVE OVER his soule to death." Remarkable are the words of our Saviour in relation to his death and resurrection in John x. 17, 18. "Therefore, saith he, doth my father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No—one taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received from my father." And in John xiv. 31, he declares his readiness to submit himself to death in obedience to the command of God.

Ibid. — he took away the sins — ] Bishop Lowth's version is, "he bare the sin." See the first note on v. 4. For ἁμαρτίαν, *sin*, read ἁμαρτίας, *sins*, with the LXX, Heb. ix. 28, 1 Pet. ii. 24, and Lactant. Inst. Div. iv. 18. Coverdale's version is, "he shall TAKE AWAYE THE SYNNES of the multitude."

Ibid. And made intercession for transgressors.] This last line is otherwise translated in the present copies of the LXX, Καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας [ἀμαρτίας, MS. Alex.] αὐτῶν παρεδόθη, and in several places Justin agrees with them; but in p. 73 he hath, Καὶ τοῖς ἀνομοῖς ἐξήλασται, being an exact translation of the present Hebrew. The verb, as Bishop Lowth observes, ought to be in the præterit, as it is in one MS. In the Vulgate it is so, "Et pro transgressoribus ROGAVIT," or, according to some copies, "ORAVIT."

M. D.

THE

## III.

THE ILLUSTRATION OF CHRIST'S LAST  
DISCOURSE WITH HIS DISCIPLES, CON-  
TINUED, JOHN XIV. 4, &c. TO THE END  
OF THE CHAPTER.

IN this xivth, and in the xvth and xvith chapters of St. John, our Lord addresses himself, to his eleven apostles only: for the wretched man, Judas, had a very short space before abruptly left the company, with a secret design, known only to his divine master, of betraying him into the hands of those who sought his life. And his whole discourse, though containing much useful information for all others, relates immediately to those his chosen followers. For it was peculiarly suited and adapted to their situation, and intended to support and encourage them under the apprehensions of his soon going away from them, and in their anxious uncertainty what would become of themselves; who without his presence and counsels would feel utterly incapable to carry on the important work to which he had appointed them, of calling a sinful world to repentance, and to the knowlege and attainment of eternal life.

Jesus therefore, in this place, sets himself to quiet and remove these desponding fears; by assuring them, that the honourable office, in which they had engaged, would not only still be continued, but that they should also be favoured with extraordinary qualifications and assistance therein. And



he begins with acquainting them, in language to which they were accustomed; that in *his Father's house*, i. e. (See p. 7, 8, &c.) *in the church of the living God* here upon earth, *there were many mansions*; in the societies and congregations of his followers, which would be gathered and established in all parts, there would be ample employment for them, full scope and room to lay out their talents and labours to the best purpose; and moreover, that his going away, which they now so much lamented, would be the very means of deriving to them the needful aids they wanted.

Having thus given them encouragement, though they might not then comprehend the whole extent of his meaning, he mentions again his being soon to leave them; as it would be of use to them to have their thoughts familiarized to it.

Ver. 4. *And whither I go, (says he) ye know; and the way ye know.* A very small interval before, unwilling to alarm them too much, he had, in the most affectionate manner, touched upon his final departure from them; (xiii. 33—37.) *Little children, yet a little while I am with you*, and so on. Here, as the time drew still nearer, with the same kind, considerate thought, he instructs them, *whither he was going*; what would be the happy end of all his labours; but reminds them also of *the way*, that was to lead to it. He was going (a) *to the Father*, (as he soon after speaks of himself,) from whom he, and we all came. But it was a rugged way through

(a) The favourite apostle takes pleasure in recounting this language, and in speaking of his divine master, in a stile, so expressive of his high authority from God, and of his certain and speedy admission into his nearer presence and favour for ever. Not long before he had said, (John xiii. 3.) *Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands: and that he was come from God and went to God &c.*

through which he was destined to pass, in the midst of cruel outrages, and by a violent death; of which, though he had at other times informed these his disciples in the plainest language, they could not enter into it, nor allow themselves to believe it a thing that would ever happen to him: such mistaken ideas did they entertain, of his true character, and of the nature of that kingdom, which he came to establish.

Ver. 5. *Thomas saith unto him; Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and, how then can we know the way?* This disciple, who in all probability spoke the sentiments also of the others, seems to apprehend that Christ would withdraw to some other region, of which he had never told them, and there establish his kingdom: for this idea and prejudice cleaved to them to the last, and they interpret much of what he says according to it. In his reply, our Lord strives to draw them from all thoughts of this world's honours and greatness, and with great solemnity teaches how they all were to go to the Father in the end; to whom himself was now soon going.

Ver. 6. *Jesus saith unto him; I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man (b) cometh unto the Father but by me.* i. e. "I am the true way to life: or, I am the true and living way. It is only by becoming

(b) *No man cometh unto the Father, but by me.* This is not spoken of the heathen world, but of those who enjoy the advantages of the christian revelation, and neglect them. In like manner, those similar, and often misinterpreted and misapplied words of Peter, signify no more, than that the nation of the Jews, to whom he is speaking, were not to look for any other Saviour and Messiah than the holy Jesus, whom they had lately rejected and put to death; viz. *Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.* Acts iv. 12.

becoming my true disciples, in listening to my precepts and following my example, that any one can go the Father, and obtain eternal life."

Ver. 7, *If ye had known me* (continues our Lord) *ye (c) should have known my Father also* : i. e. "Had you properly attended to me, whom you believe to be sent from God, the Messiah; and well weighed the gracious message which I have brought from the heavenly Father, you would have been fully acquainted with that most benevolent parent of all, and with his love to mankind."

— *and ye know him*, or rather, *ye (d) shall know him from henceforth*; (by a change of tense very frequent with our evangelist) i. e. "you shall be hereafter favoured with a fuller knowledge of him;" tacitly alluding to his own resurrection, ascension into heaven, and the sending of the gifts of the holy spirit to his apostles; which would still farther manifest the divine wisdom and goodness: to which he adds,

— *and ye have (e) seen him*. He so speaks, to remind and make them sensible of the advantages they

(c) *Ye should have known my Father also*. By knowing God, our Lord does not mean the knowledge of the divine nature and manner of existence; of which the highest of created beings must remain ever in ignorance. But he intends those marks of the most perfect wisdom and goodness in his word and works, by which the almighty creator is best known to us; and particularly his design to bring the lost human race to eternal life and happiness, which himself, the Messiah, brought to light.

(d) Our translators very properly render afterwards, (xv. 27.) *Kai vñus te μαρτυρεῖ, and ye also shall bear witness*; not, *ye also do bear witness of me, &c.* But as they have not always attended to this idiom of the hebrew writers, the defect is here and elsewhere supplied. See ver. 19, &c.

(e) *And ye have seen him*. As it was said above, of knowing God; so may we observe, of seeing him; that none hath seen him; so far as that implies a full comprehension of all his ways



they possessed, in what he had already revealed to them, concerning this first and best of Beings, and giver of all things to himself and to all. But their minds were so much occupied with the general prejudice and expectation of their nation, of some magnificent and glorious exhibition of the almighty Being in favour of their Messiah, to allow them to understand what he now says unto them, and which would have been otherwise plain and easy. One of them therefore,

Ver. 8. *Philip saith unto him; Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us.* They had read much in their sacred writings of the visions of holy men and prophets, and various manifestations of himself, which God had given in former times; and fondly wished for something of the kind now. This leads our Lord to a farther explanation: and it is pleasing to observe, from this short dialogue, upon what kind and familiar terms he lived and conversed with his disciples.

Ver. 9. *Jesus saith unto him: have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father: and*

ways and designs. He is the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality; dwelling in the light, which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, or can see. 1 Tim vi. 16. There is also a sense, in which Christ had seen God, and no other persons, but those to whom he has discovered him. This consisted, in his being alone made acquainted with the secret councils of the Almighty, relating to the gospel, and the salvation of mankind; and communicating them to others. Which is what our Lord intended, when he here says, that his apostles had already seen the Father. The same is the meaning of that declaration of the evangelist; No man hath seen God at any time: the beloved Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath made him known. See John i. 18.

*and how sayest thou then; shew us the Father? i. e.*  
 “ I am sorry that you who have been so long about my person, and seen my miracles and heard my discourses, should so little understand my character and the office I sustain from God, as to express a desire of *seeing the Father* in any other way than I have all along discovered him to you. A vision from heaven, or the most majestic external symbols of the divine presence, would fall far short of giving that knowledge of the almighty Being, which, I have thus imparted, by bringing you acquainted with his gracious will and designs of goodness for you and for all mankind.”

Ver. 10. *Believest thou not that I am (f) in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself: and the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works. i. e.*  
 “ Can you, my disciples, entertain any doubt of my speaking and acting intirely by the authority and under the direction of the Father; who have so often told you of it. The doctrines I deliver to you are only such as I have learned from him, without any additions of my own. The miracles I work are from his power, enabling and supporting me.

(f) *I am in the Father, and the Father in me.* All that our Lord intends by this figurative, sublime way of speaking, is; that he acted by the power, and authority of God, and in obedience to him, and therefore that he was his great prophet and messenger, the Messiah. And he puts the proof of it in the next verse, on his miraculous works: which, as they were above all human power to effect, and he never asserted that he was any other than a man, or had of himself any other power; it followed evidently, that God acted in him, or was with him, or assisted him in an extraordinary manner; or, that he was the Messiah, which he took upon himself to be. In another place, (John x. 38.) our Lord explains in the very same manner, how it was, that *the Father was in him, and he in the Father.*

me. This therefore should satisfy you, that by having heard my discourses, you have had so far a perfect knowlege of God; and have seen all that is to be seen of him."

Ver. 11. *Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very work's sake.* i. e. "If you will not believe it on my own assertion, that *I am thus in the Father and the Father in me*; yet let my miracles, which carry undeniable evidence of a divine power, convince you of it; for I have no power to do such things myself, nor ever claimed it as my own; and this therefore demonstrates that God is with me in an extraordinary manner."

Ver. 12. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth in me, the works that I do, shall he do also; and (g) greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto the Father.* Our Lord here re-

turns  
[*(g) — greater works than these shall he do.*] There were many and very extraordinary miracles done by the apostles, recorded in *The Acts*. But the most singular and extraordinary miracles were those wrought by the gifts of the holy Spirit, bestowed upon them, and of which they had a specimen given on the day of Pentecost, in speaking (*Acts* ii.) languages they had never learned. These were afterwards, in a rich variety and abundance (*Rom.* xii. *1 Cor.* xii.) distributed to the apostles, and by their means to christians in general: by which believers were greatly multiplied, and the christian church built up and established. And it is probable, that our Lord, in the encouragement which he here gives to his apostles, had an eye to this circumstance, and to the effects of the miracles that would be wrought by those his first followers, in the conversion of many thousands of jews; and of heathens in still vastly greater numbers, to the belief of the gospel, in the space of a few years, far beyond what the holy Jesus himself had been able to accomplish, though he laid the foundation: *he laboured first*, (*John* iv. 38.) *and they entered into his labours*. See a good note of Wolfius upon the place.



turns more directly to the subject with which he began, and which he keeps sight of continually; viz. the extraordinary divine assistance, which would be given his apostles for their encouragement, and to qualify them to preach the gospel with effect, after he should be departed from them. As though he had said; "There is one thing which will convince you farther of the interest which I have with the heavenly Father, and that I speak and act by his power and under his direction; (*viz. that I am in the Father, and the Father in me,*) that the same divine power which has been conferred upon me, shall also be bestowed upon you in such a degree as shall qualify you to preach the truth with far more effect and success than I have done: *because I go to the Father, i. e. because the Father and sovereign disposer of all things has destined and reserved the extraordinary effusion of the spirit, the communication of miraculous gifts in the greatest abundance, to put his last seal to the gospel, after I shall be taken away from you; and to do honour to me his first and chief instrument whom he hath employed in it.*"

Ver. 13. 14. *And whatsoever ye shall ask the Father (h) in my name, that will I (i) do, that the Father may be (k) glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask*

(b) *Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name*] The name of Christ, is the religion of Christ; or the gospel. See Acts viii. 12. xv. 26. xxvi. 9. 1 Pet. iv. 14. 1 John iii. 23, &c. &c. And asking the Father in Christ's name seems plainly from what goes before, to be a request of something connected with the gospel, some particular interference of the Divine Being as a mean to promote it.

(i) *That will I do*] When Jesus says *he will do it*; it signifies no more than telling them, in the most affecting manner, that it shall be done. The remark of a friend.

(k) — *that the Father may be glorified*] i. e. in order that the religion sent from heaven may be most amply extended.

*ask any thing in my name, I will do it.* i. e. "Whatsoever thing ye shall request of God in prayer, in full confidence of this promise of a divine assistance which I make to you, in order to promote the success of the gospel, it shall be granted you; that the heavenly Father, to whom every thing is due, may be honoured in the accomplishment of his own benevolent designs by the gospel. For your comfort I repeat it; whatsoever ye shall thus seek from God, it shall be done."

Ver. 15. *If ye love me, keep my commandments.* i. e. "Remember that an indispensable condition of your receiving this divine assistance promised to you, is your continuing your regards and affection for me; which can only be shewed by obeying the will of God, which I have taught you. You may then depend upon every thing needful for you."

Ver. 16. 17. *And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another (1) advocate, that he may abide*  
I 2 *with*

(1) *another advocate*] Christ himself had hitherto been the advocate of his disciples, in pleading and defending the cause in which they were engaged, by his unwearied labours and preaching, his miracles and holy life. He here promises them another advocate, who would be sent in his stead, and plead their cause more successfully than he had done; and who would also remain with them through their whole lives, when he could be no more with them. This was accordingly verified after Christ's ascension, in the *holy Spirit* that was given to the apostles, i. e. in the various gifts of a Divine Power for the confirmation of the truth of the gospel, bestowed upon them.

It may cast some light on the scriptures, and upon this figurative way of speaking, to observe, that our Lord, who here calls himself the advocate of his disciples with the world, whilst he was with them; is afterwards stiled by our apostle, in another of his writings, an advocate of sinners with the Father. *If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous.* John ii. 1. In this description of the apostle, Christ is the advocate of sinners, one whom they may absolutely

with you (m) for ever, rather, through life; the (n) spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he shall dwell with you, and shall be in you. To revive their spirits and make the deeper impression on them, our Lord expatiates a little on the divine assistance which would be communicated to them, personifying it, as though it would be another

lately depend upon, in that he is that holy, just, (Acts iii. 14.) righteous person, who found such favour with God, as to be authorised by him to promise men not only the pardon of sin; but also everlasting life, on their returning obedience to his commands: for in no other way but that of obedience, nor by any other means, can sinners become acceptable to God. Ezek. xxxiii. to ver. 20. Christ is not an advocate for sinners in any thing he is now doing for them, in pleading their cause at present; (scripture rightly interpreted gives no countenance to such gross conceptions) but as having done every thing necessary to restore them to virtue and to the divine acceptance, whilst he was upon earth.

Our Lord says, in one place, to the unbelieving Jews; (John v. 45.) *Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father, there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust.* He would not be understood to intimate, that Moses was, or would at any time become in fact their accuser before God: but he uses such strong lively painting to convince them, that they would be most justly condemned for not hearkening better to the teachings of that divine law-giver, which would have prevented their rejecting himself as their Messiah. As Moses was not literally an accuser of the unbelieving Jews; so is not Christ literally an advocate of sinners. Christians have fallen into great errors, in this and in other instances, by ascribing to Christ personally, what is spoken only of his doctrine, and the salutary effects of it.

(m) *abide with you for ever*] *eis ton aiōna*, i. e. as long as ye shall live. See Gr. in Philem. ver. 15, and see Lxx. Exod. xxi. 6. Deut. xv. 17, Ps. lli. 9. lxi. 4. and cxix. 44. 111. This is Bishop Pearce's note.

(n) *the spirit of truth*] So our Lord calls that divine power, by which they, his apostles, would be fully instructed in the knowledge of the infinite goodness of God to mankind revealed by



another friend that would come in his room to them, and supply his place when he should leave them; agreeably to the lively figurative stile of the prophetic writings. And he calls it, *the spirit of truth*; because it would contribute to the leading of them into a full knowledge of every thing relating to the gospel, which was necessary for themselves, and for the information of the world concerning it. We may conceive him then, perhaps, as thus addressing them, in other words; "Interested as I cannot but be for your well doing, and earnestly desirous of the success of your labours, I shall make it my business to pray to the heavenly Father, (and I know that my prayers will be heard,) for him to grant you such divine extraordinary aids, as may

by him, and zealously disposed to communicate it to others. The like language is used beforehand by the prophets, concerning the powers with which Christ himself was to be indued; indicating from whom he was to receive them. I give Bishop Lowth's translation of a passage of Isaiah.

*But there shall spring forth a rod from the trunk of Jesse;*

*And a scion from his roots shall become fruitful.*

*And the spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him;*

*The spirit of wisdom, and understanding;*

*The spirit of counsel, and of strength:*

*The spirit of the knowledge, and the fear of Jehovah.*

Isaiah xi. 1, 2.

By this we are given to understand, that the holy Jesus, foretold to be born of David's family, was to be under such a divine influence, as would render him wise, and prudent, and qualify him for his great and important office; such as would also empower him to do miraculous works, and to set an example of the most perfect obedience to God, and direct others therein. And in correspondence with this, after he had entered on his public ministry; we read (John iii. 34.) *God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him*; i. e. he was under the most extraordinary and constant divine influences, beyond all other heavenly messengers and prophets.

may always be at hand to counsel, defend and support you, on all necessary occasions, in preaching and spreading the truth of God, to the end of your lives. But though I am impowered to make you the promise of such supernatural heavenly assistance, you are not from this to imagine, and presume, that all men will be immediately brought over to the truth, how ever ardently to be wished and sought for by you: *the world*, (proceeds he, and would be understood by them at first, as pointing to their jewish rulers and nation, the first opposers of the gospel;) i. e. men of ambitious worldly minds, having no relish for the things of God, will pay no regard to any thing that relates to him, and will make light of all communications from above. *The world cannot receive him, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him, for he shall dwell with you and be in you:* i. e. but ye know how to value such divine gifts and assistance, and shall hereafter have happy, and ample experience of them."

Ver. 18. 19. *I will not leave you orphans: I will come to you. Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more: but ye see me: because I shall live, ye shall live also.* Two different advents, or comings again of Christ to his disciples, after his going away from them at his death, are here understood. One, his coming again to them, not in person, but all the same in effect, by the promised assistance of the holy Spirit. This is intended in his saying; *I will not leave you orphans*, destitute and helpless: but *I will come to you again*; i. e. by that extraordinary divine power, which shall supply my place, and cherish and support you.

Christ's other coming again, which he here also points to, was his personal appearing to and conversing with his apostles and other disciples, after his

his death, before his being finally taken up into heaven : for by them only, as he here speaks and not by *the world*, by the unbelieving part of the nation, was he seen, after having been restored to life; as indeed there would have been in many respects an impropriety, had it been otherwise. And in this sense, the words that follow, are to be taken; *Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more: but ye shall see me: because I shall live, ye shall live also.* i. e. "I am soon to die: and though I shall be no more seen by those who have rejected my testimony to the truth; I shall appear, and make myself known to you. For I shall be raised to life, never to die again; and my restoration to life after death, will be a pledge and security for your not remaining for ever in the grave, but being raised again to life, as I shall be."

Ver. 20. *At that day ye shall know, that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you.* i. e. "When that time comes, that you shall have obtained the most perfect assurance of my being raised from the dead; and when also this my promise of the Spirit shall be fulfilled to you; ye shall then enjoy the most convincing and satisfactory evidence, that *I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you*; i. e. of that high favour and power from God which I possess, and which by means of me will be derived upon you, for your attachment to me, and adherence to the gospel."

Ver. 21. *He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and (o) manifest myself to him.* i. e. "But these com-

(o) *εμφανισω αυτω εμαυτον.* I will manifest myself to him.] The same phrase is used of the extraordinary divine presence by the LXX. Exod. xxxiii. 13. *εμφανισοι μοι σεναν, δεω thyself to me.*



communications of a divine power, (as I have said, ver. 15.) will be the privilege only of those of you my disciples, who shall shew your regard and true affection for me, by obeying the holy commandments I have taught you; and to him, *who thus loves me, &c. I will manifest myself* by the gifts and illuminations of a divine power, which he shall receive." Our Lord here again alludes to the *holy spirit* which he had promised from almighty God, that it would be bestowed upon his disciples after he had left them; and which would answer every purpose to them, as if he himself were to be present with and manifest himself in person to them at such times. So (Matt. xxviii. 20.) the last words which the evangelist records as said by our Lord, after his resurrection, to his apostles, are; *Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the age*; i. e. during the apostolic age, whilst a miraculous power was judged proper to be imparted to his followers. Christ was with them in that period; not in person, but in the fulfilment of the promise he had given, of such a power being communicated to them from almighty God.

Ver. 22. *Judas saith unto him, (not Iscariot) Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?* This disciple, still impressed with the national prejudice concerning their Messiah, wonders to hear his master Jesus talk of being so private, and not discovering himself to the whole nation, but confining his favours to the small band of his disciples. He might have seen, how unreasonable his question was, and the proper answer to it, had he attended to our Lord's discourse at the very moment. Jesus therefore contents himself with repeating what he was mentioning, with a very small change only in the expression.

Ver. 23:

Ver. 23. *Jesus answered and said unto them ; if a man love me, he will keep my words : and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. i. e. " I have already told you, why I shall manifest myself to you my disciples only : and it is because you are pious and upright men, and lovers of the truth, and shew your affection for me by attending to the instructions I give you. And those among you who are thus rightly disposed, shall have experience of the divine assistance in an extraordinary manner, as you shall stand in need of it, in your office of preaching the gospel."* This is intended by his saying, *my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.* In ver. 21. he had said ; that *he, Jesus, would manifest himself* unto all such worthy disciples ; meaning thereby, the presence of the holy Spirit, or divine power that would be granted to assist them, according to his promise ; which being to supply his place, now that he was about to leave them, he styles as he was wont, *his own coming again* to them : as it would indeed answer all the ends of it. In *this* verse, continuing the same highly figurative and dignified stile ; since this promised divine assistance of course came immediately from God, he represents the communication of it to his disciples, under the idea of himself and the heavenly Father, both together, *visiting them, and taking up their abode with them.*

Ver. 24. *He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings : though the word which you hear, is not mine, but the Father's which sent me.* Our Lord adds this as a reason, why he could not manifest himself to the world at large, as he should do to his faithful disciples ; because such persons having no love to him or to the truth, would pay no re-

gard to the precepts of piety and virtue, which he delivered : and for any to disregard these, who had them fairly proposed to them, was a matter of serious and fatal consequence ; as it was not barely to despise his authority, but that of God himself, whose messenger he was.

Ver. 25. 26. *These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the advocate, the holy spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.* i. e. " These things I have mentioned to you, whilst I am myself with you. But the divine assistance, which I said above *I would send to you*, but which more properly speaking, *the Father will send on my account*, after my departure from you, will not only bring to your remembrance what you have heard from me, but give you a more perfect knowlege of what I have taught you."

Ver. 27. *Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you : not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.* i. e. " I must soon take leave of you. And I now give you my blessing. The good wishes of worldly persons are too often as little sincere as they are ineffectual. Mine are very different : for my affection for you cannot be doubted, and I am able to assure you of the especial protection of heaven. Be not then overmuch grieved at the thought of my departure, nor afraid of what shall happen to yourselves."

Ver. 28. *Ye have heard how I said unto you ; I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved (p) me,*  
ye

(p) If our Lord had said only to his disciples ; *ye ought to rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father ; for my Father is greater than*



*ye would rejoice, because, I said, I go unto the Father : for my Father is greater than I. i. e.* “ I have told you that I am going away from you, yet not so as to leave you destitute, and without one in my place, who will supply you with all the assistance you can want. Your love for me should help to diminish your sorrow at my departure, and even fill you with joy on my account; when you consider what advantage it will be to me, and the happy exchange which I shall make in being delivered out of this world of trial, and difficulty and suffering, and in going to that almighty Being, who has given me such marks of his kindness and love. For however great my powers be, he is mightier and above all, who bestoweth them, and can and will protect and bless both you and me.”

Ver. 29. *And now I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye might believe. i. e.*

K 2

“ What

*than I :* it would then have been plain, that he refers them merely to the consolation and support, which was to be derived from his being to be restored to life after death, and highly exalted by the supreme Father, whose power none could oppose, and who would certainly employ it in their behalf, as he had promised them. But when he adds; *if ye loved me, ye would rejoice, &c.* he makes use of another topic for calming their sorrowful apprehensions upon his departure from them; viz. that it was a thing to be desired by himself, (having finished his work, John. xvii.) to leave this world, in which nothing but pain and suffering was thenceforth to be looked for by him, and go to those happier scenes of farther improvement in the knowledge and love of God, and happy employment in his service, which were destined and reserved for him. We should be cautious of assigning wrong motives to Christ's actions: but when he himself intimates, as he frequently does, that he was supported under his sufferings for truth and virtue, by the prospect of a future and blessed immortality and of the divine favour for ever, which he was authorized to open and propose to his followers; we should not overlook such circumstances, as they lead us to a just idea of him, and of the benefit of the example which he has set us.

"What I have now foretold, relating to my own future dignity and advancement, and the divine assistance which will be bestowed upon you, is done with this view, that when you see these things accomplished, you may have an intire confidence in me, and depend upon all my other promises being made good to you."

Ver. 30. 31. *Hereafter I shall not talk much with you: for the (q) prince of this world cometh, and bath nothing in me. But that the world may know, that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. i. e.* "It will not be in my power to spend much more time in conversing with you. The wickedness of mine adversaries is now at work to apprehend and cut me off. And though nothing but innocence can be found in me, and I have not deserved such treatment, I contentedly yield myself up to it: that I may give proof to all men of my filial trust in and attachment to the heavenly Father, and that his commandments are dearer to me than my life, which I chearfully resign in obedience to him ;

(q) *the prince of this world cometh.*] Our Lord here speaks in the popular stile, as if there was one great evil Being, the author of all wickedness; but he intends only the spirit and principle of sin and evil, which is in men themselves. He had said, not long before, alluding to the prevalence of this spirit of wickedness, which would soon be checked, and in the end destroyed, by the preaching of the gospel; (John. xii. 31.) *Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out.* The apostle styles it; (Eph. ii. 1.) *the prince of the powers of the air,\* of the spirit, that now worketh in the children of disobedience.* And what Christ would here convey to his disciples, which they would shortly find to be true, was, in other words; that the evil passions and malignity of their jewish rulers, with the rabble under their influence, were at that moment in secret machination to seize and slay him; and would very soon effect their purpose.

\* See Farmer on miracles, p. 159.

him; and think myself happy in being employed by him, to carry on his designs for the salvation of the world."

#### COROLLARIES.

##### I.

The praying *in the name of Christ*, above enjoined, related only to the apostles and the *r* times, viz. Where he thus directs; *And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask any thing in my name, I will do it.*

1. For it appears in the preceding paraphrase, and is evident from the connection of our Lord's discourse, where he lays down this command for *praying in his name*; that it has a direct reference to the miraculous works for the more effectual establishment of the gospel, concerning which he was speaking; and which he promises his apostles they should be enabled to perform. And therefore such prayer could be intended only for the use of the apostles, and in those times, when miraculous powers were dispensed. But as the gift of such powers has been discontinued for many ages, if indeed they went at all beyond the time of the apostles, this kind of prayer terminated with them of course; and belongs not to christians in these days.

2. The very nature of the prayer prescribed, shews that it could only be offered up in those times, when an extraordinary divine protection and assistance was vouchsafed to the followers of Christ. For since, in the very terms, our Lord declares, *whatsoever things ye shall ask the Father in my name, that will I do*, or, it shall certainly be granted to you: it is evident, that the particular things they were to ask



ask for, must be suggested to their minds by that gracious Being, who alone heareth and answereth prayer. For otherwise, it cannot be supposed, that every thing they should be disposed to ask for would be such as infinite wisdom would think proper to grant them, let their views and designs have been ever so pious and upright. Therefore when they prayed for any thing in particular; when Peter and John, for instance, healed the man who had been lame from his birth: they must have been assured that their desire would be granted, by some secret divine impression made upon their minds, before they undertook to say to the man; (Acts iii. 6.) *In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk.*

And that this was the method of the Almighty's conduct towards them in this matter, we learn from our Lord himself. For a short time before, upon his devoting to destruction a barren fig-tree, thereby to impress them more strongly with a sense of the ruin that would come upon their wicked unfruitful nation, for rejecting the divine admonitions to repentance and reformation which he had delivered to them: when the apostle Peter, *the next day, seeing the fig-tree dried up from the roots, saith unto him,* (Mark. xi. 21. &c.) *Master, behold the fig-tree, which thou devotedst to destruction is withered away. Jesus answering, saith unto them; have faith in God: For verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass; he shall have whatsoever he saith. Therefore I say unto you, whatsoever things ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them.* This belief or inward persuasion of their requests being really

really granted, which Christ exhorts them to seek for when desirous of doing any particular miracle, could only come from God, and must have been wrought in them by his immediate hand; because otherwise, the strongest convictions in their own minds of a thing taking place, could not afford any sort of proof of it's actually coming to pass.

The late venerable Dr. Lardner seems not to have succeeded so well as he commonly does, in his interpretation of what our Lord speaks, of the assured success of *prayer* offered to God *in his name*. And as the authority of that most learned and excellent person deservedly weighs much with many, it may be proper to consider what he has advanced upon it.

It is in explaining those words of Christ, near the close of his last farewell discourse, the former part of which we are treating upon; viz. *And in that day ye shall ask me nothing. Verily I say unto you; whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name. Ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full.* John xvi. 23, 24. The sense of the words more fully expressed, seems to be; "When you, my apostles, shall be made happy in the most perfect assurance of my resurrection and high favour with the heavenly Father of us all; although I shall then be taken away from you, and you will not have me to have recourse to under the difficult circumstances of your ministry, as you have hitherto been wont; you shall have the loss amply repaid to you. For I repeat what I have told you just now, (John. xiv. 13. 14. xv. 7. 16.) that your requests to God, in such cases, for special aids in promoting my gospel, shall certainly be granted. Hitherto, being always with you, I gave you no such directions or encouragement on your application

cation to God in the quality of my disciples : I now warrant you the fullest success in it upon all emergencies."

But Dr. Lardner (r) thus interprets ; " One reason of this assurance of being heard is, that they who pray in Christ's name, or according to his directions, ask for nothing but what is lawful and good, with a view to the glory of God ; and with resignation to his will, if they are temporal things. Therefore their prayers are heard, and their petitions granted. They either receive the good things they ask ; or have what is better, strength to practise self-denial and patience, and thereby to glorify God."

The mistake (s) here arises from taking it for granted, that our Lord is giving directions for the ordinary prayers of his followers in all times, to obtain such

(r) " Of praying in the name of Christ," vol. ii. serm. xi. p. 282.

(s) This valuable writer falls into the like mistake, as might be imagined, in his interpretation of the words ; *hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name.* " The meaning is not, says he, as some have supposed, hitherto ye have not made use of my name in your prayers : but hitherto ye have not prayed as my disciples ought to do. Hitherto your prayers have wanted something of that spirituality and heavenly-mindedness, which becomes my doctrine." Id. Ibid. p. 301.

There seems however no just ground from our Lord's words to conclude, that he blames his disciples for being deficient in the proper dispositions to render their prayers acceptable to the Divine Being ; or that Christ intended to teach them any new and more prevailing form and idea, by making mention of his name, under which they were from thenceforth to offer up their prayers. But he informs them of a circumstance that would be very welcome to, as it would be much needed by them ; viz. that hitherto they had had no such promise of a divine extraordinary power to aid them in preaching the gospel, as he now gave them ; and moreover could assure them, that it would not fail to be granted them, upon their prayer for it.



*such spiritual and temporal good things as they should want*: whereas he addressees himself only to his apostles, and gives *them* instructions concerning such prayers as they should offer up to God, *for an extraordinary assistance in preaching the gospel*. And though he says at large, *whatsoever things ye shall ask the Father in my name, I will do it*, (xiv. 13, 14.); the general expression, *whatsoever things*, is to be limited to the miraculous works immediately before mentioned, which he tells them they should be enabled to perform; and to *those things* only. And moreover our Lord's words do not suppose or allow any alternative of their receiving benefit in other ways, from their prayers, although they should not have the satisfaction of having them answered directly; but he states and declares the absolute certainty of their success in them. And this necessarily leads us to consider them as preferring their particular requests, under the influence of the divine power which was to accomplish them, and to enable them to do the miracle desired: for without this, no such absolute success and accomplishment could be expected.

Dr. Lardner is much happier in giving the sense of the passage immediately following that of his text, viz. (1) "*At that time ye shall ask in my name: and I say not, that I shall pray the Father for you. This I need not say, though I shall certainly do it. For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God. A sincere faith in me, and an open profession of my name, without worldly views, from a conviction of truth, are in themselves very acceptable to God. And he will approve you and bless you, though I were not particularly to interest myself in your favour.*"

L

In

(1) Id. Ibid. p. 274.

In this injunction therefore for praying in his name, our Lord does not speak of the *ordinary* prayers of his followers in those times, or of those of his apostles to whom his words are immediately addressed: but he treats only of their special prayers, on particular occasions, for the holy Spirit, for a peculiar divine assistance, to qualify them to preach the gospel with success throughout the world. So that this command of praying in the name of Christ, does not seem to extend to those who have no such promise of the holy Spirit made to them, but is to be considered as confined to the apostles and first christians. For we have no certain evidence of those divine powers being continued after the time of the apostles.

## II.

When we find the holy Jesus continually addressing his own prayers to the heavenly Father; directing his disciples also to pray to him: Luke xi. 1. 2. *One of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. And he said unto them; when ye pray, say, OUR FATHER, which art in heaven, &c:* When we see him, as here, in-joining his apostles to pray to the Father in his name; but never once commanding them to pray to himself, nor giving the least intimation, that he himself was the object of worship: it may teach us what to think of a practice so very universal among christians, as that of praying to Jesus Christ; and may put some upon serious reflection, how they can justify themselves in joining in and countenancing such a practice.

From

## III.

From what has been stated in the foregoing paraphrase and note subjoined, concerning our Lord's saying, *I am in the Father, and the Father in me*; it appears, that Jesus thereby assumed nothing to himself above the condition of the Messiah, the anointed prophet and messenger of God, distinguished and favoured with extraordinary wisdom and powers from him.

It appeared also, that in explaining this language, expressive of such an intimate connection with the Divine Being, Christ did not refer to an unknown metaphysical union, by which some would make him to be God equal to the Father: but he appealed to a plain fact, the power of the Father working in and by him. And at the same time he declared, that the like divine power would be given to his disciples, and operate in them. So that if any would from such expressions, deduce, that Christ was God; or a Being above the condition of a man; it would prove also that his apostles were such.

## IV.

In a very just and true sense, God is in all his creatures, and they in him; as *in him* (Acts xvii. 28.) *we live, and move, and have our being*; and all our powers are derived from and each moment sustained by him; not a thought in our hearts, nor any action done by us, but what are known to him long before. But the language here used of *the Father being in Christ, and Christ in the Father, and in his disciples*; of Christ's *dwelling in and manifesting* himself to them, cannot properly be used concerning christians now, as it implied the communication of an extraordinary miraculous as-



stance from God, which has ceased for many long ages.

It should seem therefore very wrongly adopted now by christians in their devotions, public or private; as it tends to raise undue and groundless expectations of secret divine communications, and to mislead those who make use of it.

# V.

The piety and humility of Christ are conspicuous here, as every where.

Notwithstanding the high things which he says of himself, of the great powers which he possessed, and the unlimited confidence he would have his disciples to put in him, he is careful to let them know, that he had nothing but what he received from God. Says our Lord to them; ver. 10. *The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself: and the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works.*

In the midst of those sublime mystic terms of union and intimacy with the Deity, in which he describes himself, after his resurrection and translation to heaven; as attentive to the prayers and necessities of those his first followers, and ready and active to *do* for them, whatever they wanted (ver. 13, 14.) upon their prayer to almighty God: Notwithstanding what he speaks of his *coming* to them, (ver. 18.) his *manifesting* himself to them, and *making his abode* with them, in conjunction with the supreme Father of all (ver. 21, 23.): he takes care to inform them, that it is not of himself, in person, that he says these things; but of the *holy Spirit*, the divine power extraordinary, which he was authorized to promise them, to aid them in preaching and spreading his religion in the world; and

and which he speaks of, as if he himself were to be with them, because it was to supply his place in his absence from them.

When he inculcates upon them, that such singular marks of the divine favour would be conferred only on his true disciples, on those who *kept his sayings*; he reminds them at the same time, with his usual modesty; that he was no more than the servant (ver. 24.) and messenger of God in delivering those *sayings* or commands to them. And he finishes, so far as we have gone, with acquainting them, (ver. 30, 31.) that he voluntarily yielded himself up to the violence and injustice of his enemies, and the extreme sufferings that were coming upon him; that he might evidence to the world his love and submission to God, and be serviceable in promoting his designs for the virtue and happiness of the world.

## VI.

Almost every word concerning the Deity uttered by Christ, declared or implied, that the Father, the God and Father of himself and of all, was the only true God. He sometimes lays it down in terms the most express and clear: John xvii. 1. 3. *O Father; this is life eternal, to know Thee, THE ONLY TRUE GOD.* Here he says; (ver. 28.) *My Father is greater than I.* From which it has been well inferred; *that Christ therefore is not the TRUE GOD; for none is, or can be, greater than him.*

The device by which christians in the dark ages strove to invalidate and set aside this strong testimony of Christ's own words against his being the supreme God, which they at all events would have him to be, and which device is still kept up and maintained; has been, by dividing him as it were  
into

into two persons ; or, as it is commonly expressed, making him to consist or to be compounded of two natures, one divine, the other human; and by asserting, that when he utters such humbling things of himself as this, *my Father is greater than I*, he speaks it only of his human nature, as he was man : for that by his other, divine nature, he was, all the while, God equal to the Father.

This is the last resource of scholastic subtilty and refinement, to evade the force of Christ's express declaration, who, and what he himself was. It were earnestly to be wished, that the learned would at last grow ashamed of defending what deserves not a grave refutation; and then the common christian will have some chance of arriving at the truth in the important article concerning the God, whom he is to worship.

## VII.

It is a pleasing character of the supreme universal parent, and nothing dark or unintelligible in it, which the scriptures throughout hold forth to us, and to which our Lord often refers in this his farewell discourse, viz. of God *dwelling* with his creatures of mankind, of having his house and habitation as it were, among them. God is indeed always present with all the things that he has made, to support and preserve them. But this more familiar language of *dwelling* and *making his abode* with men, is made use of to mark his more especial care of and attention to particular persons and nations.

His peculiar and especial residence of old was in the midst of his church and people of Israel, in the tabernacle and temple built by his order and direction.



rection. There he was said to dwell, manifesting occasionally his presence among them, by extraordinary significations and displays of his will to them, and of his providence over them.

When these communications with that chosen nation gradually wore away, and were at last entirely withdrawn; then *the word* (John i. 14.) *ο λογος*, *wisdom, became flesh and dwelt among us*, as our evangelist speaks, in allusion to the description of the Almighty given by Solomon, Prov. viii. i.e. The divine wisdom, word, power, by which all things were made; by which God frequently manifested himself to the old world, and to his people Israel, did last of all manifest itself to men in the person of the man Christ Jesus, and in him dwelt among us; and by this, he was enabled to work mighty miracles, in proof of his divine commission and authority, and to declare to men the mind and will of the heavenly Father. *Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself: and the Father that dwelleth in me he doth the works.*

The blessed Jesus was thus the habitation of God, the temple where he dwelt: where, in the most glorious manner, the great God manifested his presence and power, and delivered his oracles, as of old in the tabernacle and temple.

In the like, though in a vastly inferior manner, and degree, the apostles and others of Christ's followers, in that first age of the gospel, are stiled *the temple of God*, and God is said to *dwell in them*, and to *make his abode with them*, through those gifts of a divine wisdom and power, communicated under certain limitations to them, which were imparted (John iii. 34.) to the blessed Jesus *without measure*.

If

If Christ here says concerning himself and the power by which he wrought his miracles, *ver. 10. the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works*: he uses the same language concerning his apostles, *Matt. x. 20. It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of the Father that speaketh in you*. St. Paul exhorting the christians of Corinth to purity and temperance, says (1 Cor. iii. 16.) *Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy: for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are,*

#### POSTSCRIPT.

THE writer having received the following remarks, from a learned and judicious friend, upon the interpretation of two passages in his former tract, is desirous of giving them a place here; and has no doubt but he shall thereby gratify all lovers of free and serious inquiry into scripture-truth.

“ I have no doubt that in the third verse in  
 “ the xivth of John, *where I am*, signifies in the  
 “ *church of God*. The connection of this phrase  
 “ with *mansions of the Father's house*, determine it.  
 “ There is no such decisive circumstance in John  
 “ xii. 26. And here, what both precedes and fol-  
 “ lows this phrase immediately, creates in me some  
 “ doubt of Calvin's interpretation. Perhaps it  
 “ refers not so much to the *service* as to the  
 “ recompense: *τιμησει αυτον ο πατηρ*. On Calvin's  
 “ idea, it should have been *εσω* like *απολαβειτω*.  
 “ May I add once more? If in the 24th verse  
 “ of the xvii. chapter, the prayer that *those that*  
 “ *God*

“ God had given him might *be with him*, signifies  
 “ being united with Christ in purifying and en-  
 “ lightening mankind; is not this a superfluous  
 “ repetition? Has not this been already asked  
 “ in the four immediately preceding verses? I  
 “ have been something checked, while I wrote  
 “ this question, by considering that John, whose  
 “ own manner abounds in repetitions, is the con-  
 “ veyer of this discourse. I admit that by this cir-  
 “ cumstance the argument just suggested by me  
 “ is considerably weakened. Yet perhaps there is  
 “ something in it still. There is not here more  
 “ than in the xii. 26. any thing to confine the  
 “ meaning of *being with Christ*, to *services in God's*  
 “ *church*. To *behold my glory*, I should think  
 “ good hebrew, for *partaking in my glory*, *being*  
 “ *made glorious like me*. Cautious indeed one ought  
 “ to be, not to exhibit Christ as a vain and selfish  
 “ character: but acknowledging him to be a man,  
 “ I see no reason to be shy of admitting that he  
 “ was capable of being upheld (and under the  
 “ great trials to which he was appointed actually  
 “ needed to be upheld) by the exhibition and an-  
 “ ticipation of better things to come, not only to  
 “ his doctrine in this world; but to himself in  
 “ another; where, beyond the reach of suffering,  
 “ he should himself be improved in the knowlege  
 “ and the love of God, and blest with more liberal  
 “ communications of his favour. Is not Christ  
 “ the exemplar of our recompense as well as of our  
 “ duty? I think we should not scruple to exhibit  
 “ his celestial happiness and glory, as matter of  
 “ joy and congratulation to those who love him \*;  
 “ and sometimes to hold him up as an example of  
 “ the

\* Christ seems to make this representation of it himself. See  
 above. p. 66, 67.



“ the *means*, by which the most perfect virtue at-  
 “ tainable in this world, must be sought; and on  
 “ such occasions to speak of what *he did for the*  
 “ *joy* (Hebr. xii. 2.) *that was set before him*, and  
 “ *was enabled to do by it*: a joy, in the mind of the  
 “ writer to the Hebrews, so far as I can see, pa-  
 “ rallel to Moses’s recompense of reward; to that  
 “ *better resurrection*, &c. &c. In a very elevated  
 “ mind, even great dangers and afflictions, great  
 “ and happy expectations will bring *self* in view:  
 “ and the one must sometimes be contemplated to  
 “ carry it resolutely and honourably through the  
 “ other. Nay, I know not, whether the superior  
 “ affections could live and thrive, without some  
 “ occasional recruits from the inferior ones, out of  
 “ which they were generated. In fact, it seems  
 “ to me, that in the history of Christ, *self-attentions*  
 “ do appear, and that necessarily, properly, amia-  
 “ bly and usefully. Interpreting the xvii. 24. of  
 “ *recompense*; may not the two last verses of the  
 “ chapter be conveniently interpreted, as contain-  
 “ ing the grounds on which Christ entertained the  
 “ pleasing hope, which he had expressed to the Fa-  
 “ ther, concerning his disciples in the 24th verse;  
 “ explaining *know* (*γινώσκω*) in it’s practical sense, as  
 “ comprehending the sentiments and conduct that  
 “ properly belong to those apprehensions of the  
 “ understanding, and to which the term refers.”

#### SOSIPATER.

---

*Errata.*—Page 22, line 5 from the bottom, for John xvi. 26,  
 read John xii. 26.

Page 45, line 4 from the bottom, *dele* and in St. Luke.

---

# COMMENTARIES

AND

ESSAYS.

NUMBER II.

---

IV.

## CRITICAL NOTES ON THE FIRST NINETEEN VERSES OF THE FIRST CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

TO give a history of the creation of the earth, it's inhabitants and all the visible bodies that surround it, events that precede the very existence of the historian, is at once to lay a decided claim to revelation; and in this respect the history itself necessarily differs from every other. Any other history may be sufficiently credible as to the principal facts, though some mistakes may have crept into the detail of the minuter circumstances; but the history of the creation being delivered by immediate revelation must be exact in every point, or lose all title to credibility. Neither is it one of those parts of the divine scriptures, which, their importance being merely relative to some particular

time or place, may without any ill consequence become obscure at other times and in other places : on the contrary, it being the first link in the great chain that connects God with man, it must contain no circumstance, which, by it's contrariety to any known truth, might render it obscure, or liable to exception. Nevertheless I see no repugnancy in allowing that any part of a revealed system may become obscure, through other causes intirely relative to the persons to whom it is immediately delivered. Their notions, derived from immediate impressions on their senses, may in other points of view be deemed false; their language may become obsolete, and it's expressions compared with those of other languages, refined and cultivated in a more polished state of society, may appear vague and indeterminate : but obscurities of this sort, at least in the more important parts of the scriptures, are easily dispelled. Providence has so managed matters, that a sufficient knowledge of the sacred languages has never been wanting : and it seems to me the duty of an interpreter, so to restrain and explain every vague term, as to render it's signification consistent with every subsequent discovery of any natural truth, so far as any such precise determination may be any way included within the general meaning of such terms ; for it appears to me to be a fundamental principle, that *the sacred books*, (or at least the most important parts of them,) *being designed for all ages, must be taken in such a sense as is intelligible and true in all ages.*

Hence it follows that, in general, a harsher interpretation of the books of holy scripture than of any other book of human composition, is perfectly justifiable and consonant to right reason : for the evidence of their divine origination being exceedingly



ingly great, the improbability that the obvious meaning, if evidently false or absurd, is the true meaning is equally great; and any meaning is *barsh* in proportion as it is less obvious.

That this principle no way detracts from the respect due to the sacred writings, but on the contrary tends to support it, appears not only from the reason of things, but also from the example of men of known learning and piety in all ages. It is expressly laid down and defended by Jerom in his first book against Rufinus.

If the *obvious* sense of words should be rejected when contrary to right reason, much more should the *literal* sense when different from the obvious; by obvious I mean that which is *dependent*, and by literal that which is *independent*, of position and circumstances; and thus it frequently happens that the figurative becomes the obvious.

Another maxim carefully to be attended to in the interpretation of all writings, is the end or scope of the writer, which, if not apparent in the writing itself, is ever to be collected from collateral circumstances, respecting either the subject-matter, the writer, or the persons to whom the writings are immediately addressed.

With respect to the first chapter of Genesis, the end which the sacred writer had evidently in view was to inform the Israelites of the divine origin of all things, the unity of the godhead, the confraternity of mankind, and the origin of the sabbath; and also to guard them against the vain speculations of the Chaldeans and Egyptians, who thought that matter was eternal.

## GENESIS CHAP. i. 1—19.

**Ver. 1.** *In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.*

## NOTES.

*In the beginning.]* The Hebrew original is said to be susceptible of two senses; for it may be rendered *at first*, or *when first*. But the view which Moses had of combating the opinion which the Egyptians and Chaldeans entertained of the eternity of matter clearly decides in favour of the first interpretation.

*God.]* The literal interpretation of the original expression, אלהים, is *Gods*; from whence many have inferred a plurality in the divinity. This argument, if it proved any thing, would prove too much; for it would prove a plurality of Gods. But the expression is evidently an Hebrew idiom. Thus Gen. xlii. 30. where we read, *The man who is the Lord of the Land spoke roughly to us*: the Hebrew has, *the man who is the Lords of the Land*.

*Created.]* The Hebrew word signifies *made*, a vague expression including both creation and modification; but the intention of Moses being evidently to establish the divine origination of all things in contradiction to the current opinion of the Chaldeans and Egyptians, and the glaring absurdity of any other interpretation leaves no room to doubt of the propriety of the first.

*The heaven and the earth.]* The Hebrew has *heavens* in the plural, and so it should be translated. Thus in the 19th Psalm, ver. 1. *The heavens declare the glory of God*. By this word all the bodies superior to the earth are to be understood; and consequently the sun, moon and stars must be deemed to have been created on the first day, as well

well as the earth, the planet we inhabit, though not compleatly fitted for their respective uses, otherwise it would be impossible to say what was meant by the *heavens*. Hence we necessarily infer, that the laws of gravitation and impulsion, chymical affinities, and every other peculiar to inanimate substances, were immediately constituted and coeval with the creation, there being no reason, either from the nature of things, or from the sacred text, to postpone them.

Ver. 2. *And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.*

#### NOTES.

*Without form and void.*] This should rather be translated, a *confused and useless mass*. It could not be without form or shape, as all it's materials were already created, and it's shape, from the power of gravitation, was necessarily round, or rather elliptical; and in effect the Hebrew words will bear this interpretation, the word, *תהו*, being derived from the root, *תהה*, which signifies *to be stupefied* or *confounded*, and in this sense it is taken, Jerem. iv. 23. where the prophet describing the future devastation of Judea by Nebuchadnezzar, who, he says, will make the land a scene of confusion; and hence the Septuagint renders it by the word *invisibile*, the earth being confounded and mixed with the water, and by reason of it's specific gravity, for the most part, sunk under it, and partly diffused through, and dissolved in it.

The word, *ובוהו*, signifies also *useless*, and in this sense it is taken, 1st. Samuel i. 22. *The sword of Saul returned not empty*, that is, useless or without performing it's proper effect. The proper effect of the earth is *solidity* or *consistency*, which it was then deprived of by it's mixture with water.

*And darkness was on the face of the deep.*] Or, in other words, there was as yet no light to illuminate this mighty mass, which is called an abyss from it's softness and great depth.

*And*



*And the Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters ;* that is, an internal commotion was perceivable on the surface of the water. Some have imagined the word *spirit* to denote *wind* ; but this cannot be the sense of this text, for the atmosphere did not as yet exist, as appears by the 6th verse. The word *spirit* evidently denotes the divine power or energy, as it frequently does in other parts of the divine writings. Thus in Psalm civ. 30. *Thou sendest forth thy spirit and they are created.* Job xxvii. 3. *The spirit of God is in my nostrils ;* for the sacred writers, either from unacquaintance with natural philosophy, or through piety, frequently ascribe all power and agency immediately to God, from whom in effect it primarily proceeds. Thus Psalm cxlvii. 18. David attributes the liquefaction of ice to the power or spirit of God. *He sendeth out his word and melteth the ice ; he causeth his spirit to blow and the waters flow.*

*Moved.]* The original Hebrew word, מרחפת, denotes a tremulous or internal motion ; it occurs but twice in the Bible. Deuter. xxxii. 11. As an eagle *fluttereth* over her young ; and Jerem. xxxiii. 9. They shall fear and tremble. From whence it is plain, that a tremulous internal motion is indicated.

*Waters.]* As the water is here all along supposed to be in a liquid state, it is evident, that it must have been heated to at least thirty-three degrees of Fahrenheit. And it's heat was not derived from the sun, but was coeval with it's creation, since the sun was not yet formed.

Ver. 3. *And God said, let there be light and there was light.*

#### NOTES.

*And God said, let there be.]* These expressions, which often occur, in the stile of the sacred writers, denote nothing more than the agency of natural causes, except where a miraculous effect is clearly concerned. Thus Job xxxvii. 6. *He said unto the snow, be thou on the earth ;* and Psalm cvii. 25. *He commandeth and raiseth the stormy wind.* Even the agency of moral causes, though operating evil, is in this manner ; and by the same expression, often attributed immediately to God. Thus 2 Sam. xvi. 10. Da-

10. David attributes the curses of Shimei to the order of God. *Let him curse, for the Lord said unto him curse David;* and verse 11. *Let him curse, for the Lord hath bidden him.* Yet it is evident by 1 Kings ii. 8. and 9. that David himself well knew that these curses immediately proceeded from Shimei's malice. In the present case, some powerful natural causes were actually operating, as clearly appears from the intestine motion or effervescence already mentioned.

*Light.*] The Hebrew word, *אור*, here used, denotes *fire*, as well as *light*. Thus Isaiah xxiv. 15. *Glorify the Lord in the fires,* *אור*; and Job xxxvi. 30. and xxxvii. 3. this word denotes *lightening*, which is well known to be a flame. And hence the writers of the New Testament make even the Greek *πῦρ* to denote also fire. Mark xiv. 54. We may therefore, without departing from the literal sense, suppose, that it here denotes *flame* or *bright fire*, rather than pure light, which is now known to proceed from, or at least to derive it's energy from the Sun and fixed stars, which were not yet formed. This flame we may with great probability deduce from numberless volcanos, which at this period were kindled within the bowels of the earth. To understand how these fires could arise, it is necessary to recollect: 1st. That the great mass of phlogistic or inflammable matter now dispersed in the bodies of animals and vegetables, and in the atmosphere, did at this period exist solely in the earth itself, the former not being yet formed.

2dly. That the proportion of water in the terraqueous globe is far smaller than that of it's solid contents, as appears not only by observation as far as this reaches, but also by the specific gravity of the globe, as lately determined by Dr. Hutton, Phil. Transf. 1778.

3dly. That by the superior specific gravity of the solid parts, the water was, immediately after the creation, extruded from the interior parts, and lay on the surface of the globe, as mentioned by Moses.

In this state of things it is easy to conceive, that the phlogistic, sulphureous and ferruginous masses might heat  
and

\* But see Bp. Lowth's Translation and Note.

and inflame, as they do at this day under the bottom of the sea. The air necessary to produce flame is now well known to arise from several minerals, as Wolfram, Manganese, Calamine, &c. and at that period they must have contained much more of it, as all the air at present in the atmosphere existed in them. That fire may burst out through water, appears from several instances in modern times, particularly that which happened near Tercera, one of the Azores, in the year 1720. Phil. Trans. Abridg. vol. 6. part 2d. page 203. The existence of these primæval volcanoes clearly appears from the incorporation of volcanic matter with granite, which has frequently been observed in several mountains.

Ver. 4. *And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness.*

#### NOTES.

*God saw the light, that it was good.]* This signifies only, that the volcanic operations were good and tended to the perfection of the globe. The absolute perfection of any thing being sublimely denoted by the approbation of the Supreme Judge of all perfection.

*And God divided the light from the darkness.]* That is to say, the volcanic eruptions broke out at different successive periods, betwixt which darkness prevailed.

Ver. 5. *And God called the light day, and the darkness be called night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.*

#### NOTES.

*And God called.]* There being no person to whom God is introduced as speaking, it is evident that this is a mere Hebrew idiom, denoting that the period of light formed a sort of day, and the period of darkness, night.

*And the evening and the morning were the first day.]* That is to say, the period of darkness and that of light formed a space



a space or interval of time, analogous to our day of twenty-four hours, which is also made up of periods of light and darkness, but in other respects considerably different, each period being of indefinite duration; whereas our's is completely measured by a revolution of the earth on it's axis.

Ver. 6. *And God said, let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.*

Ver. 7. *And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament, from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so.*

Ver. 8. *And God called the firmament heaven, and the evening and the morning were the second day.*

#### NOTES.

In these verses the formation of the atmosphere and the evaporation of the waters are related in the same sublime style, as the foregoing event, attributing immediately to the Deity, what in reality proceeded also from secondary causes. The immense quantity of air, set loose by the torrefaction of mineral substances, must in time have formed that mass of air which constitutes the atmosphere, and perhaps from it's quantity that of the materials from which it arose may in some measure be computed. The evaporation of water followed of course, and produced the separation mentioned by the sacred historian.

**Firmament.** This is ill translated; it should have been rendered *Expansion*, which is the genuine signification of the Hebrew word, רָקִיעַ, denoting an attenuated substance.

*And God called the firmament heaven.]* Here, and in verse 10, it is evident, that the phrase, *God called*, signifies no more than *was called*; namely, the bodies superior to the earth were called heaven.

Ver. 9.

Ver. 9. *And God said, let the waters under the heaven be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so.*

#### NOTES.

Here the important effects of the formation of the atmosphere and of the volcanic fires are summarily described.

In the first place, the globe was prodigiously cooled; for it is now known that aerial fluids absorb and retain in a latent state a prodigious quantity of elementary fire during their formation, and so also do vapors; and as all this fire was drawn from the denser mass of the globe, and converted from a sensible into a latent state, it is evident that the denser parts must have been considerably cooled.

2dly. The immediate effect of the refrigeration and diminution of the aqueous part of the globe must have been the precipitation and crystallization of the saline, earthly and metallic substances dissolved in it; and hence the formation of stones, metallic ores, and granitic stones. Much of the watery part must have been absorbed, as we at this day find that limestone contains about one-tenth of it's weight of water.

3dly. Inequalities being thus formed on the face of the globe, both by mountains and the immense cavities left by volcanic fires, the waters gradually retired to the lower parts keeping in solution much of the most soluble parts, namely, salts, and thus formed seas and oceans.

Ver. 12. *And God said, let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after it's kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth; and it was so.*

#### NOTES.

As we find both by experiment and observation, that the earth has not at this day the power of producing vegetables without seed, we must in this place take the phrase, *God said*, for an immediate act of the divine will, producing all species of vegetables, the earth being already fitted for their reception by the preceeding events. It is probable, that by the growth of these vegetables the  
atmos-

atmosphere was purified and fitted for the support of animals, according to Dr. Priestley's discovery.—In the higher regions it is still less pure.

Ver 14. *And God said let there be lights in the firmament of heaven to divide the day from the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days, and for years.*

Ver. 16. *And God made two great lights, the greater to rule the day, and the lesser to rule the night. He made the stars also.*

Ver. 19. *And the evening and the morning were the fourth day.*

#### NOTES.

Having concluded his account of the formation of the earth, the sacred Historian next proceeds to that of the sun, moon, and stars. They were undoubtedly created on the first day; but it here appears that they were not rendered luminous until the fourth period, and probably, like the earth, underwent some changes before they were fitted for their final destination. What these changes were, as they are not here mentioned, it is not allowed us to guess at.

*To divide the day from the night, and for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and for years.*] Moses here alludes to the most obvious uses of the sun and stars to the inhabitants of the earth, without excluding other purposes, equally real though less obvious.

*Two great lights.*] The denomination *great* relates only to appearance, according to which Astronomers frequently express themselves even at this day.

*The fourth day.*] Here and in all subsequent places the word *day* is to be taken in it's usual sense, being now measured by the presence of the sun.

R. K.

A PA-



## A PARAPHRASE AND NOTES ON ROMANS v. 8—19.

IT has been imagined by many eminent divines, that mortality became the lot of all mankind in consequence, not of personal, but of Adam's transgression. This opinion appears to be a relic of the doctrine of original sin. The part of scripture which is thought to be it's principal support, is Rom. v. 12—19. It will be useful to examine this passage, together with what precedes and follows it, in a short paraphrase.

- Rom. v. 8. But God confirmeth his love to us, by this incontestible proof, that while we were  
 9. yet *sinners* Christ died for us. It is much more probable then, that now we are *justified*, and have our past sins forgiven, by means of his death and blood-shedding, we shall be rescued, by his instrumentality, from every kind of punishment. [He means from lying for  
 10. ever in the grave.] And if while we were enemies to God, the *death* of his Son was the mean employed to bring us to terms of peace with him; much more probable is it, that now we are in a state of friendship, his son's *life* should be made subservient to the promotion of our welfare. [By being an earnest of our resurrection, and by his having power, in consequence of his revival, to raise us from the  
 11. dead.] Not that what I have already mentioned (v. 2 and 3.) are the only subjects on which we Christians may boast the interest we have

- have in God: we may likewise glory in him, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whose means we are arrived at this state of peace, on this following account: viz. the universality of the resurrection to all Christians, the Gen-
12. tile as well as the Jew. As by means of one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin: and after this manner, *i. e.* in consequence of [*personal*] sin, has death pervaded all mankind; being the point to which the
  13. crimes of every individual tended. For during the interval between Adam and the promulgation of the law, sin was in the world, and men were guilty of various personal transgressions: but where there is no law to adjust the precise degree of guilt, and the respective punishment due to every crime, sin is not estimated, nor the exact enormity of different trespasses ascer-
  14. tained: But on the contrary, death reigned the sole penalty of every crime, from Adam to Moses, even over those, whose transgressions bore no resemblance, in nature or heinousness, to that of Adam: whom, as the introducer of death, I consider as a character similar to another person, who was to come after him, and
  15. introduce a revival from the grave. Yet mistake me not: there is by no means an entire correspondence, in every respect, between the offence, and the free-gift. For first, if the *sin* of one man has been instrumental in bringing death upon mankind; it is much more reasonable to suppose, from the mercies of the Deity, who is ever more liberal in blessing than severe in punishing, that the *favour* of God, and the *gift*, which the *love* of another man, Jesus Christ, has been instrumental in bringing among us, will be more abundant in their effects; will do more than reverse the sentence of mortality, pronounced

- nounced against disobedience in general upon Adam's lapse; will, besides a revival, impart happiness and glory to all men. [*i. e.* to all Christians, Gentile as well as Jew, who deserve it.] And again: the gift of God is not introduced among us, (as was the rule, or judicial act, connecting disobedience and punishment) by means of one sinner: for the general judgment was denounced in consequence of one sin, and had a direct tendency to condemnation: but the gift was offered in consequence of many sins, and has for it's object, justification, and compleat exemption from future punishment.
16. I say compleat justification: For if one man's *sin* was instrumental in advancing death (to dominion, by means of one man: it is much more natural to believe, that the receivers of that abundant favour and gift, consisting of instruction and promises in this world, and a revival in the next; and bestowed with a view to final *justification*; will be raised to dominion over death; and be exalted to life without any farther dread of dissolution, by means of one
17. man, Jesus Christ. So then, having mentioned these cautions and restrictions, I return, and assert, that as one sin was the circumstance upon which the judicial act took place, and has [eventually] affected all mankind to their condemnation, Gentiles as well as Jews: so the righteousness of one man, which has been so perfect as to obtain justification, is the medium by which a free gift will be granted to all men, Gentiles and Jews; the tendency of which is an acquittal from the sentence of mortality.
18. For as the disobedience of one man was instrumental in constituting all men sinners, [by occasioning the sentence of death to take place against the disobedient in general, a description which
19. which



which includes all men; who, according to the rule then established, are treated and punished as sinners] so the obedience of another man will be instrumental in justifying all men, Gentiles as well as Jews, from the sentence of mortality; [by occasioning the gates of death to be opened, and a power to be granted to the obedient person, of raising all men from the grave. \*] Now the effect produced by the introduction of law, to which you Jews are so much attached, was the abundance and multiplication of offences (whether capital or not) as more prohibitions, and consequently more

\* The apostle does not say,

on account of	{ Adam's transgression Christ's obedience }	all men are reputed	{ Sinners and condemned to die. Righteous and shall be raised. }
---------------	--	---------------------	---

Adam's sin and Christ's righteousness, were only the instruments, by which these effects were produced. Nor are we even told in what manner these instruments operated to produce their effects. If we ask for the cause, the reasons and grounds of these dispensations, they are, in one case, the JUSTICE, and, in the other, the mercy of God, uninfluenced by any foreign circumstances whatever, and independent of any being besides himself. We learn both from reason and revelation, that to personal, and not to Adam's guilt, mortality is to be attributed: a sentiment not contradicted in this passage, where a casual consequence only of his transgression is mentioned. We learn too from scripture that Christ, by his obedience, has obtained a power to become the dispenser of God's *intended* mercy, and to raise mankind from the dead: but it is no-where, on the other hand, asserted, that part of Adam's punishment was to become the instrument, in the hand of God, of murdering his posterity. Concerning those who die in infancy, we must acknowledge ourselves totally in the dark. We cannot suppose them to have been guilty of personal sin, nor have we any authority from scripture to assert, that they die in consequence of Adam's transgression.

more transgressions, take place under any new law, than under that of nature. Now where sin abounds, there the favour of the executive power abounds likewise, in the acquittal of delinquents: [which shews you Jews, in particular, the necessity of embracing the gospel]

21. The view with which this merciful dispensation has taken place is, that, as sin once reigned by inflicting death, grace may hereafter reign, by giving justification to eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

#### NOTES.

Verse 9. *οργη* signifies punishment, Rom. iv. 15.

Ver. 10. *εχθροι-καταλλαγμεν*. It cannot be too often repeated, that *καταλασσω* signifies, to change from a state of hostility to peace.

Τότε πρῶτον ἐπολεμήσαμεν, ἢ νυν—πείρωμεθα καταλλαγήναι. Thuc. iv. 59. πρὸς μὲν τὸ τὰ τε πόλεμῳ—πραττεῖσθαι.—τῶς δὲ τὰς καταλλαγὰς—Demosth. Olynth. I. p. 66. Allen. This is precisely the sense in which the Apostle uses it in the passage before us.

Ver. 11. ought perhaps to be printed thus: Οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ ἔτι καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ Θεῷ (διὰ τὴν Κυρίαν ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, δι' ἣν νυν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν) διὰ τούτου. Ὡς περ δι' ἑνός.——A similar alteration in the punctuation seems necessary, John vii. 21. θαυμάζετε διὰ τούτου.

Ver. 12. ἐφ' ᾧ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ἡμαρτον.] sc. θανάτω. This expression is the same with that quoted from Demosthenes by Dr. Taylor (Original Sin) and Mr. Pyle in loc. κακὸς ἐπὶ τῷ θανάτῳ, a capital offender; and must signify that the crimes of *all men* terminated in death.

Ver. 13. Ἀμαρτία δὲ ἐκ ἐλλογῆται μὴ οὗτος νόμος.] It would have been natural for an objector to have observed from what he had read, that though death was the punishment of Adam's transgression, yet all men were not sinners like him

him in manner or degree. How then, he might have asked, does it come to pass, that his penalty of death is inflicted in consequence of every sin, however different from his? This difficulty St. Paul anticipates and removes, by saying that, at that time, no law, to adjust the various degrees of guilt and punishment, was in force, which, as I shall endeavour to prove, is the meaning of the latter part of the 13th verse. The law of nature, though the Apostle does not, in this place, include it in his idea of law, has ever been in force since the creation of man. Human beings were never otherwise than accountable: they were a law unto themselves, while their conscience bore witness to their innocence or guilt. Their constitution must have been very different from what it is at present, if debauchery (ver. 9.) did not at all times visibly occasion death: and consequently the crime was ever, even among the Gentiles, who lived, as St. Paul says, without law, *ανομως*, imputed to the transgressor. In that case, who could say, that the death of the sensualist was occasioned by Adam's sin? The only relation which the menace and sentence pronounced upon the first man (in the day that Thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely or utterly die, Gen. ii. 17. Dust Thou art and to dust Thou shalt return, iii. 19.) appear to bear to mankind in general, is, that God, in this particular instance, denounces his wrath against one offender, and introduces death, as a punishment of disobedience: whence we may conclude, by analogy, that, as he is an impartial being, he will treat other offenders according to this example: thus we find, that the only penal sanction of the law of nature was death, and diseases tending to death. 'As many as have sinned without law, *ανομως*, i. e. under the œconomy of nature, shall PERISH, *αποληνται*, without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be JUDGED, *κριθισονται*, by the law.' Rom. ii. 12. Observe the distinction between the two verbs; and that perdition was the consequence of *all* transgressions among the Gentiles. How Mr. Locke could read this verse, and suppose, notwithstanding, that there ever was a time, in which no certain and determinate punishment was affixed to sin (Paraph. on ver. 13.) i. e. to sin in general, I am at a loss to understand. Under



the Jewish dispensation, crimes and punishments bore a nearer proportion: smaller transgressions were followed by lesser imposition of fines and chastisements. Offenders were JUDGED, had their trials and sufferings regulated according to law. Having premised thus much, let us revert to the passage in question. If *αμαρτιαι ουκ ιαλοϋνται* signifies 'Sin is not imputed, or reckoned, to the detriment of the guilty, has no value set upon it,' where there is no law; I ask, How it came to pass that the heathen at the coming of Christ, who were, in this respect, exactly in the same situation with the world in general, during the interval between Adam and Moses, not having a law, and consequently, according to the supposition, not owing any debt of punishment, were offered PARDON of past sins, provided they embraced the gospel? were they afraid of the penalty of an ex-post-facto law? Should the Apostle be supposed to mean, as Mr. Locke imagines, that "though mankind must know, by the light of nature, that they had transgressed, and were liable to some punishment; though the Deity might, in his secret counsels, have decreed the punishment he would affix to sin; yet his creatures could not ascertain the price that would be demanded of them, without a positive law declaring it;" I answer, that the denunciation pronounced against Adam, and notified to all men by tradition, was a sufficient declaration. The Almighty, by that single instance, proclaimed the abhorrence in which he held disobedience in general; and the method by which he was resolved to punish it. What reason is assigned in Scripture for the destruction of the world by the deluge? (Gen. vi. 5—13.) or for the overthrow of Sodom? (xiii. 13. xviii. 20.) were those unhappy persons cut off, because Adam had fallen? have we any intimation that their excision was only hastened by their crimes; and must have happened to them, as the progeny of the first man, had they retained their innocence? are we not told that they were punished for their personal enormities, and to afford examples of the vengeance of God? The author of the book of Wisdom attributes immortality to personal righteousness, and the death of ungodly men to their own words and works. (Ch. i. 63—16. ii. 23, 24.) Enoch died not, but was translated

translated for his virtue. (Wisdom iv. 10.) And perhaps our blessed Lord is the only instance that can be produced, of one who knew no sin, and yet was mortal. The ideas of suffering and guilt were so closely connected in the minds of men, before the coming of Christ, that they looked upon the former, as a certain indication of the latter. And besides, the visible reduction of sinful individuals to the grave, in consequence of their own misconduct, was a suggestion too plain to be mistaken: The period therefore cannot signify, either, that, where there is no law in force, sin has no punishment at all affixed to it; or, that mankind are unable to know what penalty the Almighty has been pleased to annex. *ΕΛΛΟΓΗ* is indeed a word that does not frequently occur; but may, I think, (as *λογος* would bear the construction of ratio between the offence and the punishment) be rendered, to compute, to calculate; not to set an arbitrary value, but to ascertain the intrinsic worth of any thing. The meaning of the sentence will then be, 'now sin is not estimated, and the proportion of punishment, which particular offences deserve, adjusted, where there is no law in force; one design of which is, to make that distinction between greater and lesser offences.' Nor does the only other passage in the New Testament, in which this word occurs, revolt against this interpretation. Philem. 18. *Εἰ δὲ τί τιμῶσιν σε, ἢ οφείλει, τὸ τοι ἐλλογῆν.* St. Paul does not mean, 'Place it to my account, as the author of the injury;' or, 'determine what you please to have, by the way of satisfaction;' but, 'compute the real value of the grievances you have sustained, let me know the proportion in money at which you fairly rate them; make a charge of them to me, and I will repay you.' This interpretation of *αμαρτια εκ ελλογῆται* is farther confirmed by the opposition which follows: 'But *death* was the only penalty inflicted, from Adam to Moses, upon those who did not sin, *ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιωματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ*, which I cannot refer, as Dr. Taylor does, to their not sinning against *law*, as Adam did, because I know that those persons lived under the law of nature, and suppose them to have derived it, by revelation, from that Being who legislated to Adam. *Τὰς μὴ αμαρτῶσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιωματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ*, I conceive to be a general expression, denoting the variety of sins,

sins, and their dissimilarity to that of our first parent, which were notwithstanding punished with death.

I cannot help taking this opportunity of observing upon a passage in Dr. Taylor's note on Rom. v. 20. The Doctor proposes to shew 'what evidence we have, that the law of Moses was law in the rigorous sense; subjecting to death for every transgression.' This position, if I understand, I cannot assent to. For 1st. the law of Moses did not subject to death for every transgression; many offences were not capital. See Levit. xix. 20. xx. 20, 21. xxiv. 18—21. Numb. v. 7. Deut. xix. 19. xxii. 18, 29, xxv. 2. 9. 12.

2dly. When law, as opposed to gospel, is said, in the apostolical writings, to subject the sinner to death, to be the ministration of death, the word *death* is used, by a metonymy, to signify punishment in general, and of every kind; the majority of offences, indeed, under the Jewish law were capital, and the greater frequency of capital than of any other punishment makes the term, when so applied, by no means improper. Now it is a contradiction to suppose, that law can remit penalty; it would then possess a self-destroying quality; it must therefore be a ministration of death (*i. e.* of condemnation and punishment) upon the sinner, as it's opposite, the gospel, is a ministration of pardon and acquittal.

Ver. 15. οἱ πολλοί] It is evident, I think, from the whole tenour of the epistle, and many parts of this passage, that οἱ πολλοί here, and verse 19, and πάντες ἀνθρώποι verse 18, mean mankind in general, not as comprehending every individual of the human species, but as converted to Christianity, and consisting both of Gentile and Jewish proselytes. It was the chief aim of the apostle to vindicate the title of the heathen to salvation, upon their complying with the conditions required. Nor yet did his present argument demand his enlarging upon, or even mentioning those conditions; he therefore supposes *the many* to be virtuous characters, and, in opposition to jewish prejudices, asserts their claim to reign in life, notwithstanding their former alienation from God.

Ver. 17.] Δικαιοσύνη must in this place, I think, mean *final* justification, because part of the abundant gift consisted



fished in a revival from the dead. The paraphrase, I hope, will shew, that τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης ought to be rendered, not the 'gift of justification,' but 'the gift which is bestowed with a view to qualify it's receivers for justification,' otherwise I cannot understand the argument. Instances in which a distant and casual connection between two substantives is thus expressed, are frequent; τοῦτον τῆς πτωσίας If. li. 17. μαμμωνα ὁ ἀδίκος. Luke xvi. 9. βδελυγμα ἐρημώσεως. Mat. xxiv. 15.

Ver. 18. Ἀλλ' ὅτι] Supply the deficiency of this verse from verse 16. Ἀλλ' ὅτι, ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος τὸ ΧΡΙΣΤΑ ἐκ πάντας ἀνθρώπων, ἐκ κατακρίμα· ὡς καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος τὸ ΧΑΡΙΣΜΑ ἐκ πάντας ἀνθρώπων, ἐκ δικαιώσι ζωῆς. We may observe that death and revival are here considered under the light of κατακρίμα and δικαιώσις, condemnation and acquittal, which imply *personal* guilt in the sufferers.

Ver. 19. Ὡςπερ γὰρ] I think it necessary to make a distinction between disobedience, or a neglect of God's precepts, and sin, which implies law, condemnation, and punishment. Now the question in this passage is not concerning the *motive* that operated with God to introduce death into the world; nor of the manner in which the instruments employed produced their effects: we are only told what were those instruments. By *means of* one man's *sin*. Adam incurred mortality by *sin*, and occasioned a general law to take place: but there seems to be nothing in the argument to make us conclude, that his transgression and punishment gave rise to those of his posterity, independently of themselves. The parallel appears to stand thus: Christ Jesus was the first person † whose perfect obedience was rewarded with revival from the dead, and exaltation; the Almighty at the same time declared, that all men should be revived and made happy hereafter, *upon condition of their following*

† 'By man came the resurrection of the dead,' is equivalent to 'Christ is become the FIRST-FRUITS of them that slept. 1 Cor. xv. 20, 21. Whence we may argue that, by 'man came death' means no more, than that Adam was the first offender punished with DEATH.

*following his steps.* Independently of these terms, no one was ever benefited by our Lord, or saved by his righteousness alone. On the other hand, Adam being the first **TRANSGRESSOR** was punished with mortality, a doom denounced against all of his posterity, *who were so weak as to follow his example, and become disobedient like him.* Had they preserved their innocence, they would not have been obnoxious to mortality, though descended from him.

Ver. 20. *ἵνα πλεονασῇ*] It could not be God's design, in giving the law, to make sin abound more than it would otherwise have done; or to make the Jew more liable to death, as Dr. Taylor, though inconsistently with God's mercy, supposes. *ἵνα* therefore denotes not the predetermined intention, but the natural consequence; and may be rendered, so that. See Taylor's Key, §. 139.

THE learned commentator we have just mentioned, fully persuaded that sufferings and death were derived upon mankind, in consequence, and as the effect of Adam's sin, paraphrases Rom. viii. 20. in this manner.

“ For the creature, *i. e.* mankind in general considered as God's creatures, not as corrupt and wicked, were made subject to vanity, to sufferings, and death, not by any wilful act or demerit of their own, but by the sentence of God.” The Greek is *ἐκ ἐκείνου* “ which, says Dr. Taylor, denotes a criminal choice, namely, a transgression subjecting to wrath. The creature was made subject to vanity, not by sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression; but by reason of him who subjected the same—to suffering and death, before they were in being, without any choice, fault, or demerit of theirs.” Note in loc. Has not the Doctor put a meaning upon *ἐκείνου* more extensive than it will bear? It signifies only voluntary: and the passage must be rendered, ‘ for mankind was made subject to vanity and dissolution, not of

its

it's own choice or consent, (for what criminal ever submitted to punishment without constraint?) but against it's will, and by way of penalty. Now this subjection is an argument of guilt rather than innocence. Life is the earnest desire of all intelligent creatures: it is in opposition to their strongest passions, that a period of their existence ever arrives. The circumstance of their submitting involuntarily to death is mentioned, to shew the natural longing after immortality, and the greatness of the consolation offered in the gospel. How *θυσίως*, Heb. x. 26. disjoined from *αμαρτανότητων*, denotes a criminal choice, I am unable to perceive. Persons are there supposed to sin willingly, deliberately, and with their own consent, (and not by surprize) which is essential to free-agency; nor does *θελοντας* 2 Pet. iii. 5. of itself imply any criminality; the whole of which arises from the context. 'They choose to forget, though they have power to act otherwise.' As to Exod. xxi. 13. If any man killeth another *οὐκ ἐκων*, unintentionally; *ἐκων* therefore signifies designedly. Circumstances must determine whether the designs were criminal or otherwise; the Greek word by itself implies no more guilt, than the English one, wittingly, or knowingly, when unconnected with any word suggesting that idea—*ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*. Mankind, though subject to mortality, could not forbear indulging a pleasing hope, that God, of his benevolence, would gratify hereafter the desires he had implanted in them, by reversing their sentence, and granting them a revival.

### SYNERGUS.

N. B. If what I have advanced above be true, it will rather confirm the opinion of those, who believe

P



lieve the account of the fall, to be an Oriental apologue. If mortality be the punishment of personal guilt, Moses may well be supposed to have represented this part of the divine government in the fate of a fictitious character, who, in consequence of his sin, was condemned to return to the dust, of which he was made.

## P O S T S C R I P T.

Extract from CHAMBERS's Dictionary. Edit. REES.  
Art. Socinians.

“ WITH respect to the nature and state of man, Socinus thought, that the progenitor of our race was mortal, *i. e.* liable to death, *by reason of his frame; (a)* and incapable of exemption, without an exertion of divine favour and influence, which was not granted him at creation. And therefore, when the apostle asserts, that by *sin* death entered into the world, he meant, not natural mortality, but the *necessity* of dying, or eternal death. *(b)* To this purpose he explains himself: Adam, if he had not sinned, might have been preserved from death by the kindness of God, though naturally mortal: or, if he had died, been restored to life, and made immortal. By his sin he did, as it were, refuse to give himself, AND HIS POSTERITY, this blessing: *(c)* and therefore, unless the favour of God be renewed to us, we must all die, and remain in the state of the dead.

No other evil necessarily flows to all his posterity from that first transgression, than by some means or other, the necessity of dying: not indeed *through the influence*

*influence* of that transgression; but, because man, being naturally mortal, was, *on that account*, left by God to his natural mortality: (d) and what was natural, became necessary, as a punishment on the offender: (e) *consequently*, (f) they who are born of him, must be born in the same circumstances: for he was deprived of nothing he naturally had, or could have." (g)

On this opinion, if it be accurately stated, it will be proper to make a few observations.

(a) Upon philosophical, or necessitarian principles, the circumstance of "being liable to death by reason of our frame," is precisely the same as, "being punished with death," in popular language. The philosopher, not misguided by appearances, but taking a view of God's moral government from a situation in which he can see it as it is; from the point, as it were, whence the Deity himself beholds it; imputes all agency whatsoever to the Almighty. In his idea therefore, punishments are only the natural consequences our Creator has originally ordained, for the correction and final happiness of those among his creatures, whose evil dispositions he has made use of, to accomplish his plan in the administration of the world. In *reality*, no distinction is to be made between natural mortality from the constitution of our bodies, and death as a punishment of sin. The former is the philosophical, the latter the popular and anthropomorphitcal language on the same subject. In like manner the vulgar talk of the sun's rising and setting; his passage through the signs of the zodiac: while the philosopher taking his stand in the center of the system, perceives that, in truth, the sun is stationary; and that it is the motion of the earth which occasions all these appearances. See Dr. Hartley's Theory of the Mind, cap. v. sect. 3. Correspondence between Dr. Priestley and Dr. Price, p. 150. 296.

This consideration will obviate an objection against my exposition of Rom. v. 12. advanced by a most respectable

friend, from Heb. ix. 27. "As it is appointed to men once to die," καὶ ὅσοι ἀποκτείνονται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀπὸ ἀποδανῆ. The apostle, we must observe, is not directly delivering any doctrine relative to the mortality of mankind: but comparing Jesus with his brethren; and asserting, that, as his fellow creatures in general die once, so did he. *Ἀποκτείνονται* does not imply that a divine decree had taken place sentencing mankind to death, independently of their own conduct; any more than the hope laid up (*ἀποκειμένη*) for the Colossians (i. 5.) imports that they were predestinated to salvation in such a manner, that their own misconduct could not disappoint them of it. All that the apostle intended is, that such has, *in fact*, ever been the fate of the human race. He looks upon death as necessary, only because it was *experienced* to be constant. In a stricter sense he could not possibly mean it; because he himself has told us that we shall not all sleep: "we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall be caught up."—And had the word he here uses conveyed the idea of God's appointment ever so strongly, yet still as he expressly tells us "by sin came death," we must, to reconcile the two passages, have concluded, that in this he wrote like a necessitarian. From the declaration, δι' ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, I was at first convinced that death came upon all men by sin; and my only question was, whether it came upon mankind in general, in consequence of Adam's guilt, or upon every individual, in consequence of his own.

I have before observed that we had not any authority, from reason or from scripture, to assert that the death of those who expire in very early youth was the consequence either of Adam's or of personal sin. But I have since conceived, that, as the idea of divine *punishments* is adapted only to popular and anthropomorphitcal notions and language, we may, in reality, account for the death of the infant and the oldest sinner upon the same principle: and, without imagining any thing penal in either, pronounce them to be alike effects of no other cause than the divine power, and wisdom, and goodness, administering the affairs of this world in such a manner as, though inconceivable to us at present, will produce the greatest general happiness.

(b) What



(b) What difference can there be, between natural mortality, and the necessity of dying? Had mortality been natural to man, death must at all events (necessarily) have happened. On the other hand, had Adam preserved his innocence, and been under no necessity of dying, what would have become of his natural mortality? it would have been diverted by a perpetual miracle, and never been suffered to take place *in nature*. What exertion of divine favour and influence would have been requisite to keep him alive for ever, but such as supported him whilst he did subsist; and such as we all experience at this moment? In God we live, move, and have our being. Besides, the death of Adam would have been as strictly eternal, had it been the consequence of natural mortality, as it was when it originated in sin: (supposing a difference between these two ideas.) In neither case could he have revived but by the favour and agency of God. Scripture gives us no authority to say that, had he continued without sin, he would have died and risen again by the energy inherent in his original nature. Nor can we so far set bounds to the mercy of the Almighty, as to suppose that his sin made it impossible for the Deity to reanimate him.

(c) If we say that by his sin he refused to give his posterity, his innocent posterity, this blessing, or was in any sense the *cause* of their losing it, do we not maintain more than the scripture warrants, concerning the dependence of our happiness upon others? Are we ever told in holy writ, that it is in the power of any man to resign for others the mercies God intends for them? Nay, Death is always represented as a punishment in the Bible, and punishment must be personal. Socinus's doctrine may differ in the degree of it's absurdity from that of original sin: but still it is irrational, and in the same way. It informs us, that God withholds a blessing, or, in other words, inflicts a punishment, on all his creatures, for the delinquency of one. "No other evil," we are told, "than the necessity of dying, flows upon Adam's posterity, in consequence of this transgression." And is not this too great a one to be consistent with divine justice?—a loss of all possibility of happiness, without  
any

any fault of our own. It is nugatory to suppose that God permitted it, merely to have an opportunity of shewing his mercy in reviving us.

(d) The necessity of dying does not come upon mankind *through the influence* of that transgression, but man, being naturally mortal, is *on that account* left to his mortality: to the necessity of dying; to eternal death; for dead he must remain, unless a second act of God's favour reanimate us. Now what difference can there be, between these two cases, with respect to man? Had he been miraculously rescued from mortality, his natural exposure to it would have signified nothing. And as his being left to it is on account of Adam's sin, it might as well have flowed from the influence of that transgression.

(e) How could what was natural, become a punishment? If Adam had not sinned, death would not have happened, therefore it could not have been natural to him. If it had been natural, his sin would not have been the circumstance inducing it; and consequently, it could have been no penalty.

(f) "Death was a punishment to Adam: *consequently* they who are born of him must be born in the same circumstances:" *i. e.* subject to death. But how is the latter proposition a consequence of the former? A person suffers as a malefactor, are his descendants born to the same fate, in consequence of their progenitor's delinquency? Death was inflicted on Adam only as a punishment.

(g) "He was deprived of nothing he naturally had, or could have." Yes! he was deprived of life, which he naturally had, and could have as long as it pleased God to continue it. This possession his progeny likewise had, and could have, even for ever. Immortality is nothing but a continuation of the course of nature once begun; and death an interruption of it.

I shall only add, with regard to the general subject, that, (as is allowed on all hands,) the period of human life has been *shortened*, as the wickedness of  
of

of the world increased, a circumstance which affords a presumption, that the scripture account is favourable to our hypothesis; and imputes the general prevalence of mortality, not to Adam's, but to personal transgression.

Another argument, which appears to have some weight, is this, that on our hypothesis, we need not be embarrassed with a supposition, that the original constitution of Adam, before his fall, was in any degree superior to that of his posterity: or that his transgression occasioned his nature and faculties to be debased, from a degree of excellence almost angelic, to the wretched and imperfect condition, in which we at present possess them. To say that man was created mortal, is equivalent to declaring, in the popular phrase, that his death is the punishment of his sins.



## VI.

CONCERNING  
THE APOSTOLICAL BENEDICTION;

2 Cor. xiii. 14.

*The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and  
the communion of the holy spirit, be with you all. Amen.*

THIS pious farewell salutation of the apostle has been long very generally used in the churches of christians of all denominations, and in different countries, at the close of their solemn public worship.

What is wished for or desired from God, in the two former clauses, will without any difficulty be admitted to be suitable to the condition of the followers of Christ in all times, as well as in that of the apostles. Concerning the last, there have been doubts entertained; whether it did not relate to something that was peculiar to the first age of our holy religion, so as to be with some impropriety made a part of the public devotions of Christians in the present day.

It is proposed to examine the point, in order to find out what the apostle really intended, and what foundation there is for our common practice.

The meaning of the two former clauses will be easily ascertained. For it is too well known to need any proof, that *χαρις*, grace, signifies favour, gratuitous

tuitous kindness of any sort bestowed upon us. And *the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ* is the favour of God made known to us by Christ. For every thing from first to last is from God. (a) It is God, that made Christ every thing that he is to us. (b) It was out of God's original love to the human race, that Christ was appointed to die in confirmation of the truth he taught, and as a divine expedient and means to bring us to everlasting life. (c) Therefore, *the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you all*, was as much as to say; I wish you, or may God give you, all the blessings of the gospel.

And that this is the true interpretation, we may be satisfied from the apostle's frequent use of this single sentence by itself, in the concluding part of his epistles to the different churches of Christians, with whom he corresponded. Thus we read, *the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all*, Amen: Rom. xvi. 24. 1 Cor. xvi. 23. 1 Theff. v. 28. 2 Theff. iii. 18. Philip. iv. 23; where it was natural thus to take leave of them, by saying, "I wish you may be possessed of all the privileges and comforts of the gospel."

Sometimes he words it more briefly: but it is obvious, he still means the same; as, *Grace be with you*. Col. iv. 18. 1 Tim. vi. 21. 2 Tim. iv. 22. Tit. iii. 15. Heb. xiii. 25.

In the passage before us, he judged it proper to be still somewhat more large and particular in his expression

(a) *Of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever, Amen.* Rom. xi. 36.

(b) *But ye are of him in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.* 1 Cor. i. 30.

(c) *God so loved the world, that he gave his dearly beloved (τον μονογενη) son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.* John. iii. 16.

expression of the same devout valedictory wish for those to whom he was writing; and therefore he first adds; *and the love of God, be with you*; to indicate, as before alleged, that the grace or favour which we have by Jesus Christ springs from the love of God to men, as from it's source; that the whole of it, from beginning to end, as our apostle remarks in another place, [Tit. ii. 11. iii. 4. 5. 6.] is owing to *the kindness and philanthropy of God our Saviour*, which he manifested to us by *Jesus Christ our Saviour*, who was his agent or instrument employed by him; God being the original Saviour, Christ the Saviour appointed by him, acting by his authority, and by powers received from him.

It then follows, *and the communion of the holy spirit*, be with you all. Our business therefore will be to try to understand, what is intended by the holy spirit, which the apostle devoutly wishes them in this place. This we shall be most likely to come at, by taking a view of all the passages in which the phrase occurs.

An enumeration, and brief explanation of the passages in the New Testament, in which mention is made of the *holy spirit*.

Matth. i. 18. *Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the holy spirit. The holy spirit* here is the divine, (d) extraordinary power. This is confirmed by Luke i. 35, where it is expressly so interpreted;  
“ And

(d) This divine power, is sometimes styled, *the spirit of God*. Matth. xii. 28. Luke. xi. 20. where the spirit of God in the former



"And the angel answered and said unto her; The holy spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God."

Matth. iii. 11. Mark i. 8. Luke. iii. 16. *I indeed baptize you with water —, but he shall baptize you with the holy spirit.* John the Baptist here refers to the gifts of the spirit, or some extraordinary (e) divine powers, which were to be bestowed on the disciples of Christ. This is also confirmed by the apostle Peter, (Acts. xi. 15. 16. 17.) *And as I began to speak, the holy spirit fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the words of the Lord; how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the holy spirit. Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, &c.*

Q 2

Matth.

former passage is, in the parallel place of St. Luke, called *the finger*, i. e. the power of God.

It is also sometimes called the spirit of the Father, Matth. x. 19, 20. *But when they deliver you up, be not anxious how, or what ye shall speak. For it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.* Mark xiii. 11. *But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate. But whatsoever shall be given you in that hour; that speak ye. For it is not ye that speak, but the holy spirit.* What is here called *the holy spirit* is, in the parallel place in Matthew, stiled *the spirit of your Father*.

(e) These gifts of a divine power are indifferently stiled, *the spirit*, or the holy spirit, John iii. 34. *For he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God. For God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him,* Acts ii. 4. *And they were all filled with the holy spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance,* xvi. 6, 7. *Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, they were forbidden of the holy spirit to preach the word in Asia. Then came they to Mysia, and sought to go into Bithynia; but the spirit suffered them not.*

Matth. xii. 32. Mark iii. 29. Luke xii. 10. *Who-soever speaketh a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the holy spirit, it shall not be forgiven him.* The holy spirit here is the divine extraordinary power, which was most evidently manifested in the miracles wrought by Christ, in proof of his mission from God; and was displayed on the present occasion, by the instantaneous cure of a most deplorable demoniac. This the Pharisees saw with their eyes and could not deny the fact; but would not allow Christ to have done it by a power derived from God, but from some evil demon: which drew from our Lord this severe censure. In which however he does not declare they would never be forgiven: for all sins upon repentance may be forgiven: but only signifies, in the Hebrew comparative form of speech, that, in such circumstances, the sin of traducing and vilifying the divine power, by which he acted, was in guilt far greater than that of aspersing and calumniating his own person and private character.

Matth. xxviii. 19. *Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* The holy spirit is the divine extraordinary power by which the gospel was confirmed. For being baptized into the name of the Father, &c. is the making open profession of belief in that religion which the heavenly Father revealed and taught by Christ, and established by the works of his holy spirit, or gifts of a divine power to the first preachers of it.

Mark i. 38. xii. 36. *For David himself said by the holy spirit, &c.* This is well paraphrased by Dr. Clarke: "David, who was an inspired person, "speaketh thus." The holy spirit was the gift of prophecy,

prophecy, or a divine inspiration at the time, imparted to the royal psalmist.

Mark xiii. 11. Luke xii. 12. *Whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the holy spirit.* The holy spirit is the divine extraordinary assistance, that would be afforded them on such occasions: *the spirit, i. e.* the power, of the Father, speaking in them; as it is expressed, Matth. x. 20.

Luke i. 15. *He shall be filled with the holy spirit even from his mother's womb.* The holy spirit was the divine extraordinary leading and guidance, by which the Baptist was to be distinguished from his birth, and to become early remarkable for wisdom and piety.

Luke i. 41. 67. *Filled with the holy spirit; i. e.* was divinely inspired; was, for the moment, under an extraordinary divine influence.

Luke ii. 25. 26. *And the holy spirit was upon him. And it was revealed to him by the holy spirit: i. e.* he was divinely inspired, indued with a special gift of prophecy, upon the occasion.

Luke iii. 22. *And the holy spirit descended in a bodily appearance, (advis.) as a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, &c.* By the holy spirit, we are to understand those extraordinary divine powers, which probably now first were bestowed upon Christ, and in the largest measure, Matth. iii. 16. Mark i. 10. John iii. 34.

Luke iv. 1. *And Jesus, being full of the holy spirit, returned from Jordan, and was led by the spirit into the wilderness.* The foregoing account and interpretation is here confirmed. For the holy spirit, which  
Jesus



Jesus was full of, signifies those divine powers which he had just received at his baptism, to qualify him for his great office of reformer and saviour of mankind; and under a divine impulse, *led by the spirit*, he now retired into a solitude to prepare himself for it.

Luke xi. 13. *If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy spirit to them that ask him?* The holy spirit is the extraordinary divine assistance in preaching and propagating the gospel, which Christ here promises to those his first followers.

It may however be said in opposition to this; that the *holy spirit* is not to be understood in so confined a sense, but must signify spiritual good things in general; because that is the language made use of in the parallel place in St. Matthew vii. 11. *If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father, which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him.*

But a due attention to the connexion of our Lord's discourse, which is the same in both the evangelists, will satisfy us, that, in both places, his direction relates not to prayer in general, but to the particular prayers of his apostles for the *holy spirit*, or the divine extraordinary assistance. For he introduces the subject with saying; *Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened:* language, which plainly intimates an absolute assurance of their request being granted. But as the wisest and best of men know not how to ask what may be truly good for them, and often ask amiss, it cannot be imagined, that Christ would hold

hold such language to his apostles and followers in general, respecting their prayers to the almighty. He must therefore of necessity be understood to allude to the special and occasional prayer for the holy spirit, or extraordinary aids, which those his first followers (f) should be divinely directed to offer up: for to no others could such unlimited promise and certainty of success have been given. Of this particular kind of prayer, which, as far as we know, was confined to that first age of our religion, mention is made, Matth. xxi. 21. 22. Mark xi. 22. 23. 24. and in other places of the New Testament.

John i. 33. *He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me; upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending from heaven, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the holy spirit.* What is here stiled, *the spirit descending from heaven, and remaining upon Jesus*, was a visible appearance, the symbol of the divine extraordinary presence, such as was afforded, and is frequently recorded in the Old Testament, and particularly at the dedication of Solomon's temple, 1 Kings viii. 10. 11. On the present occasion, it was exhibited as a token of the gifts of the spirit, the divine powers then conferred upon our Lord. And the *baptizing with the holy spirit* here spoken of, has a reference to the gifts of the same holy spirit, or divine extraordinary power, which in a very signal manner began to be bestowed upon the apostles (g) at the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. and were afterwards  
by

(f) Matth. vii. 7. "This seems, with the following verse, chiefly to relate to Jesus's disciples in those days."

Bishop Pearce, in loc.

(g) To this transaction at the day of Pentecost, those words of the Baptist seem also to allude, Matth. iii. 11. *He that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the holy spirit, and with fire.*

by their ministration conferred on other christians. This *baptizing with the spirit*, or effusion of divine extraordinary gifts and powers, which were to mark the times of the Messiah, and do honour to and confirm his divine mission, was a circumstance of great notoriety, being expected by the jewish nation, John vii. 31; and foretold by their ancient prophet, Is. xxxv. 5. 6. Matth. xi. 4. 5. Acts i. 5. ii. 16. 17. &c.

John vii. 39. *This he spake of the spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the holy spirit was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified.* The evangelist here interprets Christ's words, as having a reference to those divine gifts or powers which were to be most plentifully bestowed upon his followers after his resurrection, and which were to give the last seal as it were to his mission, by the divine establishment of his gospel in the world. This is what he intends by the *holy spirit*, which was not yet given.

John xiv. 26. *But the advocate, the holy spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.* Christ here repeats the promise before made, ver. 16. 17. concerning the gifts of an extraordinary divine power, which would be bestowed on his apostles, to enable them to preach the gospel with effect, after his departure from them. And he speaks of this *holy spirit*, or divine power, in the lofty prophetic stile, as of a person, who was to supply his place, and instruct and assist them.

John xx. 22. 23. *And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them; receive ye the holy spirit. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are*



*are retained.* The holy spirit here spoken of, was those gifts of a divine power of various kinds, by which the apostles were to be authorized and empowered to propagate the gospel, and lay down those terms of obedience, according to which men were to obtain the favour of God, or be rejected by him; which is the meaning of *remitting men's sins*, and *retaining them*. Not that we are to interpret the passage and our Lord's words to his apostles, as if at the time they received those divine spiritual gifts; for this was not till the day of Pentecost, a short space after this, Acts ii. 2. 3. But by the significant action of *breathing on them*, which his apostles would easily understand, Christ renewed his promise and assurance of the extraordinary divine powers with which they would soon be invested. Instances of the same kind of instruction by action, we have in Jesus washing his disciples feet, John xiii. 3. 4. &c. and a little below, xxi. 18. 19.

Acts i. 1. 2. *The former treatise have I made, o Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and to teach: until the day in which he was taken up, after that he, through the holy spirit, had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen.* The *holy spirit* here signifies the divine extraordinary help and guidance, by which our Lord was directed and conducted through the whole course of his public ministry; of which the gospel-history furnishes continual instances.

Acts i. 5. *For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the holy spirit, not many days hence.* We have it here expressly declared and confirmed by Christ himself, that the *holy spirit*, which he so often spake of and promised to his disciples, was the gift of extraordinary divine powers, such as were soon after conferred upon them, on the day  
R of

of Pentecost. And he repeats it again, in the same breath——ver. 18. *But ye shall receive power, after that the holy spirit is come upon you.*

Acts i. 16. *This scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the holy spirit, by the mouth of David, spake before concerning Judas.* The holy spirit signifies the divine prophetic inspiration.

Acts ii. 4. *And they were all filled with the holy spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the spirit gave them utterance.* The holy spirit here is the divine extraordinary power, enabling them to speak the truths of the gospel, in different languages, which they had never learned.

—— ver. 33. *Therefore (Jesus) being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the holy spirit, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.* The apostle Peter declares this gift of languages to be the effect of the *holy spirit*, or a divine extraordinary power, in fulfilment of the promise of Christ.

—— ver. 38. *Then Peter said unto them; repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the holy spirit.* The *holy spirit*, or an extraordinary divine power for the furtherance of the gospel, is promised by the apostle to other sincere and faithful christians in those times; of which several instances are afterwards found in this book.

Acts iv. 8. 31. *Then Peter, filled with the holy spirit, said unto them, ye rulers of the people, &c. And they were all filled with the holy spirit, and spake the word of God with boldness.* A divine extraordinary assistance was now given to the apostles, in fulfilment of Christ's promise to them. Matth. x. 19. This is the meaning of being *filled with the holy spirit*, in this place.

Acts v. 3. 4. *And Peter said; Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the holy spirit? —*

*— thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.* The holy spirit, by a figure of speech frequent with St. Luke, is put for persons indued with the holy spirit, i. e. with a divine extraordinary power. And the lying to or imposing upon the apostles, who had the holy spirit, or a divine extraordinary power given them, was lying to or imposing on God, who dwelt in them by his spirit. 1 Cor. vi. 19. 2 Cor. vi. 16.

*— ver. 32. And we are his witnesses of these things, and so also is the holy spirit, which God hath given to them that obey him.* The holy spirit is those divine miraculous powers bestowed upon the apostles and other christians, which confirmed their testimony of the resurrection of Jesus, and of his high favour with God.

Acts vi. 3. 5. *Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the holy spirit — And they chose Stephen, a man full of faith, and of the holy spirit.* By the holy spirit are to be understood the divine extraordinary powers, then commonly bestowed on faithful men, according to Christ's promise. Mark xvi. 17. 18. See Acts ii. 38. &c.

Acts vii. 51. *Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the holy spirit.* The holy spirit is that divine power, by which God manifested himself in an extraordinary manner among the Israelites of old. See Is. lxiii. 10.

*— ver. 55. he, being full of the holy spirit, and looking up stedfastly to heaven, saw the glory of God, &c.* The holy spirit here is the divine extraordinary illumination, which Stephen was under; and which represented a new scene of things to his mind.



mind. The same as being in the spirit, Luke iv. 1. Rev. i. 10.

Acts viii. 15—20. *Who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the holy spirit. For as yet it was not fallen upon any of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the holy spirit. And when Simon saw, that, through laying on of the Apostles hands, the holy spirit was given, he offered them money, saying; give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the holy spirit. And Peter said unto him; thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. The apostle Peter calls the holy spirit, a gift of God, of extraordinary powers from him,*

Acts ix. 17. *The Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way that thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the holy spirit. Ananias is commissioned to confer on Paul the holy spirit, or divine extraordinary powers,*

— ver. 31. *walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the holy spirit, they were multiplied. The holy spirit, or the gifts of a divine extraordinary power, contributed greatly to the happiness of the first christians, and to increase their numbers.*

Acts x. 38. *How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the holy spirit, —. The blessed Jesus had the same holy spirit, or divine extraordinary powers, bestowed upon him, which was afterwards given to his apostles and followers; the same in kind, though not in degree.*

Acts x. 44. 45. 46. 47. *While Peter yet spake these words, the holy spirit fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision, which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the gentiles also was poured out the gift of the holy spirit. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter; can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the holy spirit as well as we. The holy spirit is expressly said to be the divine extraordinary power of speaking languages they had never learned.*

Acts xi. 15. 16. *And as I began to speak, the holy spirit fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the holy spirit. This relates to the preceeding transaction.*

— ver. 24. *For he (Barnabas) was a good man, and full of the holy spirit; i. e. he was eminently favoured with those extraordinary divine powers, which were then bestowed for the furtherance of the gospel.*

Acts xiii. 2. 4. *As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the holy spirit said; separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them.— So they, being sent forth by the holy spirit, departed unto Seleucia. The holy spirit, by a common figure of speech, is put for persons indued with the spirit. The holy spirit said, is as much as to say, "it was signified by divine revelation to some present." We have it expressed without a figure, Acts xi. 28: *And there stood up one of them, named Agabus, and signified by the spirit, that there should be great dearth, &c. i. e. he signified by a special divine revelation, made to him.**

— ver. 9. *Then Paul, full of the holy spirit, set his eyes on him, and said. The holy spirit, which*  
the

the apostle was filled with, was an immediate divine influence, directing and empowering him to inflict blindness upon a false prophet.

Acts xiii. 52. *And the disciples were filled with joy and with the holy spirit.* The *holy spirit* was the extraordinary divine power, which was imparted to them for the establishment of the gospel.

Acts xv. 8. *And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the holy spirit, even as he did unto us.* The *holy spirit* here was the divine power, enabling them to speak in languages they had never learned; and the apostle refers to what is mentioned above, x. 44. &c.

ver. 28. *It seemed good unto the holy spirit, and to us.* The apostles, although they were men highly favoured of God, do not arrogate to themselves the being divinely inspired upon the present occasion, or appeal to their own authority, as conscious of their being under the direction of the holy spirit, in what they were determining and declaring, in their letter to the different churches from among the gentiles: but these two things are asserted by them; 1. that God, by giving the holy spirit to the gentiles, ver. 8. in the case of Cornelius and his friends, had ascertained the point of the gentile christians not being bound to *be circumcised*; and to *keep the law* of Moses. 2. That they, the apostles, by their own deductions from this fact, and reflections upon it, were clearly convinced, that this was a signification of the divine will in this matter. The *holy spirit* then here is the gift of extraordinary powers from God, referred to ver. 8. testifying the exemption of the gentile christians from subjection to the law of Moses; of which the assembly of the apostles declare themselves fully convinced.

Acts



Acts xvi. 6. *Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia, and the regions of Galatia, and were forbidden of the holy spirit to preach the word in Asia, &c.* The *holy spirit* here, as above, (p. 125.) is a particular divine revelation and direction, suggested to some persons among them, that they should not attempt to preach the gospel for the present in those places.

Acts xix. 2. *He said unto them, have ye received the holy spirit, since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any holy spirit.* The *holy spirit* here is the gift of extraordinary divine powers, which had begun first to be bestowed upon the followers of Christ, soon after his resurrection, on the day of Pentecost; of which these persons, living in remote parts, had never heard.

— ver. 6. *And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the holy spirit came on them, and they spake with tongues, and prophesied.* The *holy spirit*, as explained by the sacred writer himself, was a power of speaking foreign languages, which they had never learned; and preaching the gospel by an extraordinary divine assistance: for this last is the meaning of *prophesying* in this passage.

Acts xx. 23. *Save that the holy spirit witnesseth in every city, saying; that bonds and afflictions abide me.* i. e. it was suggested by the *holy spirit*, or immediate divine revelation to various persons, in different places, that the apostle was to be imprisoned and hardly treated. See Acts xiii. 2. 4. above.

— ver. 28. *Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the holy spirit hath made you overseers.* See above, xiii. 2. 4. The *holy spirit* here stands for the extraordinary divine direction imparted to some of the brethren, by which  
the

the elders of the church of Ephesus had been appointed to their office, in those difficult times.

Acts xxi. 10. 11. *And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judea a certain prophet, named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said; thus saith the holy spirit, so shall the jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the gentiles.* The holy spirit is a divine prophetic revelation, made to Agabus: which he personifies after the manner of the antient prophets; who, upon delivering any divine revelation made to them, prefaced it with saying, *Thus saith the Lord, &c.*

Acts xxviii. 25. *And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word; Well said the holy spirit by Esaias the prophet, unto our fathers, &c.* See the foregoing. The holy spirit signifies the divine revelation made to the prophet.

Romans v. 5. *And hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the holy spirit which is given to us.* The holy spirit is the gift of extraordinary divine powers bestowed on christians in that first age of our religion; which were to them a token of the divine love, and a pledge of their future happiness.

— ix. 1. *I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the holy spirit.* The holy spirit, to which the apostle here appeals for the sincerity of his concern for his countrymen, is that divine extraordinary power, by which he was enlightened, and directed to speak of their rejection as the people of God.

Romans xiv.

Rom. xiv. 17. *For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the holy spirit.* i. e. the advantages and privileges of the gospel consist not in external ordinances, in the eating of or refraining from particular meats; but in a virtuous mind and well-governed passions, and the happiness that results from the *holy spirit*, i. e. from the divine extraordinary gifts bestowed upon believers, and their benevolent use of them for each others benefit.

— xv. 13. *Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the holy spirit.* The *holy spirit* is the gift of divine extraordinary powers, then imparted to the christian church. And the apostle here tells the christians at Rome, that “these gifts bestowed upon the gentiles, were a foundation of hope to them, that they were, *by believing*, i. e. embracing the gospel, the children or people of God, as well as the jews.

— ver. 15. 16. — *because of the favour that is given unto me, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the gentiles, ministering the gospel of God; that the offering up of the gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the holy spirit.* By the *holy spirit*, the apostle intends those various gifts and divine powers, by which the gentiles were set apart and distinguished as partakers of the divine favour. Mr. Locke paraphrases here; “sanctified by the pouring out of the holy ghost upon them:” Dr. Taylor; “sanctified and cleansed, not by any external rites, but by the gifts and virtues of the *holy spirit*.”

I Cor. vi. 19. *What! know ye not, that your body is the temple of the holy spirit, which is in you, which*  
S
ye



ye have of God? By the *holy spirit* are to be understood, the various gifts of a divine power and wisdom, of which there is a particular account afterwards, ch. xii.

1 Cor. xii. 3. *Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the spirit of God, calleth Jesus accursed; and that no man can say, that Jesus is the Lord, but by the holy spirit.* The *holy spirit* signifies the extraordinary divine powers then communicated to believers. And this that the apostle here speaks, is levelled against the Jews, says a learned commentator, "who pretended to the *holy spirit*, and yet "spake against Jesus Christ, and denied that the "*holy spirit* was ever given to the gentiles," (vid. Acts x. 45.

2 Cor. vi. 4. 6. *But in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God,—by pureness, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the holy spirit, that is, "by "a diligent and proper use of the various gifts of "the holy spirit, for the real good and benefit of "mankind."*

Ephesians iv. 30. *And grieve not the holy spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.* The *holy spirit of God*, i. e. the miraculous powers, conferred ordinarily upon believers, and here, by a bold and beautiful figure, considered as a person, whom they might grieve by their misconduct. And the apostle's meaning in other words will be; "do nothing inconsistent with these blessed endowments of the divine extraordinary power and favour, lest ye be deprived of them: for they are a token of God's acceptance of you, and a kind of seal or impression, which he puts upon you, to assure you of the future inheritance."

1 Thessalonians

1 Thessalonians i. 5. 6. *For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the holy spirit, and in much assurance; as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake. And ye became followers of us and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the holy spirit.* The apostle here tells these his new converts from among the heathens, that the doctrine of the gospel came to them, attended with those miraculous works, which gave them *πληροφορίαν*, a plerophory, the fullest assurance of the truth of it: and that the trials and sufferings to which it exposed them, were abundantly compensated by the joy of the holy spirit, i. e. the satisfaction which they derived from the extraordinary divine powers conferred upon themselves, as they were a sure argument of the divine favour towards them.

2 Tim. i. 14. *That good thing which was committed to thee, (i. e. the pure doctrine of the gospel just before mentioned, and of which Timothy had been divinely appointed 1 Tim. i. 18. vi. 20. a minister,) keep through the holy spirit, which dwelleth in us.* By the *holy spirit*, the apostle means the extraordinary divine gifts and powers, of which Timothy had been partaker as well as himself, and which St. Paul bids him consider as an encouragement steddily to adhere to the truth.

Titus iii. 5. 6. *Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the holy spirit, which he hath shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.* The *holy spirit* here is the gift of divine extraordinary powers, imparted to christians in those days. And as these gifts were granted in confirmation of a doctrine which required

the greatest purity of heart and conversation, the apostle calls them *the renewing of the holy spirit*, as what had a tendency to sanctify and purify those who were favoured with them.

Hebrews ii. 4. *God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the holy spirit.* The *holy spirit* is here explained by the writer to be the divine extraordinary power, communicated to the apostles, by which God himself gave attestation to the truth of the gospel.

— iii. 7. 8. *Wherefore as the holy spirit saith, to day, if ye will hear his voice, barden not your hearts, &c.* The *holy spirit* signifies a particular divine impulse upon the mind of the prophet, directing him to utter such and such things.

— vi. 4. *For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the holy spirit, &c.* The *holy spirit* here signifies those divine extraordinary powers frequently conferred upon the first followers of Christ.

— ix. 8. *The holy spirit this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, &c.* The *holy spirit* here is the divine power, which instructed and directed Moses in the ritual, which he prescribed to the Israelites.

— x. 15. *Whereof the holy spirit also is a witness unto us: for after he had said before, (Jer. xxxi. 33) This is the covenant, &c.* The *holy spirit* is the divine power, by which the prophet spake on the present occasion.

i Peter i. 12. *Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things*



things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you, with the holy spirit sent down from heaven. (h) This seems to be a plain reference to the plentiful effusion of the holy spirit upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, as related by St. Luke at the beginning of the book of *The Acts*. By the holy spirit sent down from heaven, understand the miraculous powers and gifts with which the apostles were indued.

2 Peter i. 21. *For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy spirit.* The holy spirit here is evidently the power of God, which directed the prophets in what they uttered, as from him.

Jude i. 20. 21. *But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, keep yourselves in the love of God, praying in the holy spirit, &c..* The holy spirit here is the extraordinary power of God, or a divine impulse, by which the apostles and first christians were directed, and enabled, in their religious assemblies, to carry on the public worship of almighty God, for mutual edification; an assistance at that time extremely necessary. St. Paul gives directions concerning this and other miraculous gifts, 1 Cor xiv; and in his other epistles, frequently exhorts and alludes to the exercise of them. Dr. Benson has a very good note upon this passage.

(h) See Dr. Lardner's Letter, written in the year 1730, p. 101. 102.

#### INDUCTION

**INDUCTION from the preceding passages of  
Scripture.**

THE reader will judge, if the true interpretation of the above portions of Scripture hath been assigned, and none of importance relating to the subject omitted. If it be so, we have found, that the phrase, *the holy spirit*, where used in the New Testament, does always signify the extraordinary power of God, and most commonly the miraculous gifts, of various kinds and in different degrees, which were bestowed on Christ, and on his apostles, and others his first followers, in those early times, for the more effectual propagation and support of the gospel. We then seem to be fully authorized to draw this firm conclusion; that such also is it's signification in the passage under examination; and that therefore, when St. Paul says,

2 Cor. xiii. 14. *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the holy spirit, be with you all:* by the *holy spirit*, of which he wishes them to be partakers, he means those extraordinary divine gifts and powers, which were, at that period and dawn of our holy christian religion, ordinarily dispensed to believers.

This will be farther confirmed to have been intended by the apostle, from his having treated, so largely and particularly, of these divine powers, or gifts of the *spirit*, the different kinds and due management of them, in his former epistle, ch. xii. xiii. xiv. to this christian church at Corinth; and therefore he may well be supposed to refer to the same now in his second epistle, written and sent away not long after the other.

This

This would have been still more readily perceived to have been the sense and intension of the apostle, if the term, *κοινωνια*, which we improperly translate *the communion*, with some latin versions, had been rendered, as it ought to be, *the (i) participation*, or *the partaking* of the holy spirit. For the very language of the apostle would then have led every one to see, that he speaks not of a Divine Person, or intelligent moral agent; since of such a divine Person, it would have been absurd to have wished all the members of the church of Corinth, to have (k) been partakers: but it was very natural, and shewed his

(i) See this meaning of the word *κοινωνια* ascertained, with great critical exactness and ability, by a learned and valuable writer, in "An attempt to ascertain and illustrate the authority, nature, and design of the institution of Christ, commonly called the Communion, and the Lord's Supper. By William Bell, D. D. &c. p. 70, &c." It deserves to be remarked, that the word *κοινωνια* in 1 Cor. x. 16. is twice rendered PARTAKING in Coverdale's version printed in 1550. The whole verse in that Edition runs thus; "The Cuppe of Thankesgevinge wherewith ye geve Thankes, is it not the *Partakinge* of the Bloude of Christ? The Bread that we breake, is it not the *Partakinge* of the Body of Christ?"

(k) Our present translation, *the communion of the holy ghost*, conveys to the less learned English reader, the idea of some secret intercourse with the *holy ghost*, as a person, whose influences and communications they were to expect, and thereby keeps up the groundless notion of this holy ghost being a Divine Person, distinct from God, instead of his power and energy operating upon his creatures.

And if the obsolete equivocal word, *ghost*, with which by habit we connect the idea of a thin aery person, was laid aside; and το αγιον πνευμα uniformly rendered, *holy spirit*, and not *holy ghost*: it would then be more readily apprehended by common readers, that the Spirit, or holy spirit, is nothing but the power of God, exerted by himself, or communicated in various ways to his creatures.

Our



his affectionate regards for them, to express a desire, that they might be favoured with some share of those divine extraordinary powers, which were then common, and generally bestowed on the followers of Christ; and upon which the apostle had not long before expatiated, in a very particular manner, in writing to these Corinthians.

The true rendering then of the text under examination, will be; *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the partaking of the holy spirit, be with you all, Amen.*

Our translators, to have been fair and consistent, should have always made use of the word *ghost*, or have entirely hid it aside. Thus Ephesians i. 13. should have been translated, *sealed with that holy ghost of promise; iv. 30. grieve not the holy ghost of God; and 1 Thess. iv. 8. He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his holy ghost, &c. &c.*

#### OBSERVATIONS.

## OBSERVATIONS.

Obs. I. The idea of all the members of the christian church at Corinth, being encouraged to look for, and the apostle piously wishing, that it might please God to make them all partakers of extraordinary divine powers, may appear to some persons a circumstance so out of nature and the common course of things, and so likely to breed confusion, as may make them reluctant to admit this interpretation, and seem almost sufficient to overthrow it.

But those who are struck with this difficulty, do not sufficiently attend to the state of the christian church at that time, and the necessity there was for an extraordinary interposition for its support. Without this, raw, unexperienced, ignorant persons, wholly unused to such things, and some of them just emerged out of a state of heathen darkness, could never have been able to take the lead (*m*) in the public congregation, in prayer, in singing hymns to God, in expounding the scriptures, in interpreting and explaining them to persons of different countries and languages, and conducting divine worship with proper decorum and edification to all present. So that these miraculous gifts, which it must ever be remembered, were not to be had at men's option, but at such times and on such occasions as it pleased the divine providence, instead of promoting

(*m*) To these divine gifts of the holy spirit, the apostle alludes, Eph. v. 18. 19 — *Be filled with the spirit: speaking to each other, in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs; singing and making melody in your hearts unto the Lord. It was the spirit, or the divine extraordinary power, with which they were to be filled, and from which they were to derive ability to edify one another in this sort. See a parallel passage of the same apostle, Coloss. iii. 16.*

moting disorder and confusion, would in general prove the best means to prevent it.

It is however readily confessed, that these divine powers were misused by some to whom they were imparted, through vanity and too high conceit of themselves from such vouchsafements made to them; and the congregation was sometimes disturbed by their emulations with each other. For (*n*) this, St. Paul rebukes the christians of those times, and cautions them against such a temper. Nor does it impeach the wisdom of the Divine Giver, that men should be permitted in some degree to pervert these supernatural endowments, as they do the natural powers of reason and understanding. And this great and singular benefit, we, in these latter ages, derive from the small abuse that some made of these miraculous powers very generally bestowed upon those first christians, and from the apostle's censure, and exhortations to them upon it; that it tends highly to ascertain and confirm the reality of such powers: for no one of common understanding, in St. Paul's situation, would ever have censured persons for faults which did not exist, in writing to them, as it would only have been to expose himself to derision and contempt. But this we find was by no means the case. This objection therefore, instead of weakening, tends to corroborate the interpretation here given.

Obs. II. In the foregoing catalogue of passages of Scripture where the phrase *holy spirit* occurs, the famous text 1 John v. 7. hath been omitted, viz.

*There*

(*n*) See 1 Cor. ch. xii. xiii. xiv. throughout : Phillip ii. 16.



*There are three that bear record* [in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the holy ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth] *the spirit, the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one:* and the reason of the omission has been, because the words in roman characters, and in a parenthesis, are known not to have been of the apostle's writing, (but inserted by the mistake or unworthy pious fraud of some transcriber) by the same kind of evidence, that we know the rest of the epistle to have been written by him.

Mr. Emlyn, in the second vol. of his tracts, Sir Isaac Newton, in his two posthumous letters, to name no others, cannot fail of satisfying every impartial person of the spuriousness of this verse. But lest unworthy prejudices should prevent attention to their arguments as coming from Unitarians, it may be of service to mention, that a learned foreigner, himself a believer of the divinity of Christ, being convinced, after the most diligent enquiry, that this 1 John v. 7. was not genuine, he has had the (o) courage and integrity to throw it out of the text, in his late valuable edition of the (p) New Testament. This worthy person, Dr. Griesbach, Professor of Divinity at Iena in Saxony, has been at the pains himself of examining and collecting the most ancient

T 2

tient

(o) He has in the same manner not scrupled to declare his dissatisfaction and doubt about the common received reading of 1 Tim. iii. 16. *God was manifest in the flesh:* and of Acts. xx. 28. *the church of God which he purchased with his own blood:* two passages much relied on by some, to prove Christ to be God.

(p) "Novum Testamentum Græce. Textum ad fidem codicum, versionum, et patrum, emendavit et lectionis varietatem adjecit Io. Iac. Griesbach, Theologiæ doctor, ejusdemque in Acad. Ienensi Professor Publ. ordinarius. 2 Vol. Halæ. 1777."

tient Greek manuscript copies of the New Testament in different countries, and the most antient versions; and after weighing and considering all that has been collected for and against this suspected verse, by the immense labours of Mill, Bengelius, and Wettstein, with additional matter that has risen up since their time furnished by his own observations and inquiries, has compressed the whole into as small a compass as possible, in a note upon the place. And what follows is an abridged but imperfect account of what he produces more fully, and argues upon the subject:

1. " This suspected verse, 1 John v. 7. is not found in any Greek manuscript of the New Testament, of which we have so very many preserved in Europe, in public and private libraries; except in one of very late date, written in the 15th or 16th century.

2. " It is said indeed to be also in one Greek manuscript, in the royal library at Berlin: but learned men have discovered, that this manuscript is only a copy of a printed edition of the New Testament.

3. " This verse was so much and justly suspected of not being genuine, that it was wholly left out in many of the first printed editions of the Greek (q) New Testament, and in the translations that were made of it in the beginning of the Reformation, in different

(q) " Erasmus in tertia demum editione locum hunc addidit; non convictus quidem, sed commotus tamen clamoribus variorum, exemplo editionis Complut. et narratione de codice britannico."

i. e. " Erasmus at last inserted the passage in his third edition of the New Testament; without being convinced of its authenticity, but affrighted at the clamours which some persons raised against him for having omitted it; taking pretext to do it, out of a deference to Cardinal Ximenes's famous Spanish edition of the New Testament, and upon the report" (a false one, as it turned out) " of the verse being found in some British manuscript."

different countries; and in our own English translation, at that period, and for some time after, it was always marked as dubious, by being put in a parenthesis, or printed in a different character.

4. " It is wanting in both the Syriac translations of the New Testament; (though it has crept into some printed editions of the Syriac;) and also in all other antient versions.

5. " It is omitted by all the *Greek Fathers*; and though they cite the preceding and following verses, and rake up from all quarters all the arguments they can, for the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Son, and Holy Spirit; nay, though they apply the 8th verse to the Trinity, and would prove the Holy Spirit to be God from what goes before and follows after, yet they omit this 7th verse. And there is moreover no just foundation for the *traces* which Bengelius, and others have imagined they had found of it, in some of the Greek Fathers.

6th, " The *modern Greek writers* have this verse; but their authority is of little value.

7th. " This suspected verse is found in *latin* manuscripts of the New Testament: but in none of these before the 10th century; and in many of them, sometimes not in the text, but in the margin, and with such additions and variations, as cannot but detract from their credit in this respect. And in many of these *latin* manuscripts, it is also wanting.

8th. " The first, who clearly and unquestionably " cites this suspected text of *the three witnesses in* " *heaven.* 1 John. v. 7. is (r) Vigilius Tapsensis, " about

(r) " Igitur comma istud septimum præcipue, ne dicam unice, NITITUR TESTIMONIO, FIDE ATQUE AUCTORITATE VIGILII TAPSENSIS, ante quem nemo clare id excitavit. Jam de Vigilio



“ about the end of the fifth century; and it chiefly,  
 “ or rather intirely depends upon his credit and au-  
 “ thority. But he is an obscure author, and of no  
 “ good fame. For it was his way to conceal him-  
 “ self, and publish his works under the feigned  
 “ names of other persons: and he is supposed by  
 “ very many of the learned to be the author of that  
 “ most famous creed, that goes under the name of  
 “ Athanasius.”

Having thus shewn the slender external evidence, if it can be called any evidence at all, that there is for this text, our author briefly touches upon the principal internal arguments, all of them most weak and trivial, which some still continued to insist upon for it's support against plain fact and invincible weight of testimony to the contrary: Such as— 1. “ It's supposed easy connexion with what goes before and follows.— 2. “ The probability of it's having been omitted, for it's similarity of termination with the 8th verse: though, it is observed, the words *in the earth and in heaven,*

gilio hoc observandum est parum laudabilem esse hunc scriptorem, quod libellos suos sub nominibus fictis Athanasii, Augustini, Idacii etc. maluerit in lucem emittere, quam suum nomen profiteri. Eundem hominem plures viri docti auctorem esse existimarunt Symboli istius celeberrimi, Athanasio suppositi.” It must be owned, that this is but an indifferent account of the origin of this *seventh verse*, or of the creed, which was doubtless intended to be supported by it. Not many years ago, I remember a minister of the church of England, in the north, who was wont to preface his public reading of that creed, by saying; “ Let us make profession of our faith in the words of the holy and venerable Saint Athanasius!” His congregation would not have probably paid the like attention to him, had he changed Athanasius with his titles into plain Vigilius Tapfensis. And yet the latter, whatever he was, had as much right to make a creed for others, as the saint or bishop, or all the bishops in the world met together in holy synod or council.

heaven, can by no means come under this description."

3. "That the Arians may be supposed to have erased it."

4. "That the first christians might not insert it in their copies of the scripture for public use, as it was their way, to keep their mysterious doctrines from being promiscuously known and divulged (s)."

5. "That there was something in the passage itself, that spake it to be divine."

6. "That in future times, there may be found ancient manuscript copies of the New Testament, which contain this verse, though it is not extant in any that are now known."

"If so few," concludes our author in a noble strain of honest indignation, "such doubtful, suspected, and recent testimonies, and so weak arguments, may be reckoned sufficient to demonstrate the genuineness of this suspected text, in the midst of so many and so very weighty testimonies and arguments,"

(s) This concealment of certain doctrines, as too sacred and sublime for the vulgar, was a practice derived from their heathen philosophy, and stiled *disciplina arcani*, i. e. *the doctrine of secrecy*, a thing very suspicious, both in its name and origin: but it serves, amidst other evidence, to convey very important information to us in the present instance. For it shews, to what subtle contrivances these learned heathen christians were reduced, to hide their corruptions of the original doctrine of the Divine Unity from the bulk of ordinary christians; who had received it from the apostles, and long retained it, whilst their teachers and leaders lost themselves in mystic unintelligible reveries brought out of Plato's school, about the nature of the Deity, and Christ being the first emanation from it: which the plain sense of their hearers would have instantly rejected, had they been proposed to them. So that it was a work of time and much device, to bring the common people off from the doctrine of the *Father* being the *one only true God*, which they had so strongly imbibed from the teachings of Christ and his apostles. This is a fact, on which the very eminent Dr. Priestley has poured new light in his correspondence with Dr. Horsley, and he has given a promise and opening of still more to follow in some future publications.

"guments against it, there would be no way left  
 "to judge of what is genuine and spurious in an-  
 "cient writings, and *the whole text and reading of*  
 "*the New Testament would be rendered uncertain and*  
 "*doubtful.* If it were worth the while, I could  
 "bring a thousand instances of *readings* in ancient  
 "manuscripts, and defend them, by testimonies and  
 "arguments as many and of equal validity, nay  
 "more in number and of greater validity, than  
 "those which the patrons of this suspected text make  
 "use of: nor would the defender of the genuine  
 "*readings* have so many or so strong arguments to  
 "oppose to such my vain and futile attempt, as  
 "might be urged against the defenders of the text  
 "in question. I could wish this circumstance  
 "might be better considered, not only by those who  
 "defend this verse, ( 1 John v. 7. ) but by those  
 "who plead, that it would be better to let the matter  
 "alone, and determine nothing about it, &c." (1)

## OBS. III.

(1) In our old English bibles of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.  
 it is well known that the words of the whole 7th verse and the  
 words *in earth* in the 8th of the 5th chapter of St John's first  
 Epistle, were put in small letters, and sometimes in a parenthesis,  
 to shew that they were not to be reckoned of the same certain  
 authority with the other parts of the Epistle, because the manu-  
 scripts wanted them. In Queen Elizabeth's Bible, 1566, the  
 same caution continued: but in the later Bibles in her reign,  
 between 1566 and 1580, the words began to be printed as they  
 now are; by whose authority is not known, certainly without  
 any new evidence for their genuineness; and succeeding times  
 and inquiries have still added more to the amount of the evi-  
 dence against them, so as to leave little or no doubt in the  
 breasts of the most prejudiced, who will examine for themselves,  
 that they are not the words of the apostle.

Several private persons in our own country, moved by these  
 authorities, have not scrupled to leave out or mark as dubious  
 this passage of 1 John v. 7. in their editions of this epistle.

The



OBS. III. In casting the eye over the preceding long list of passages from the New Testament, where mention is made of *the holy spirit*, it is observable that

The late Mr. Bowyer put it in a parenthesis, in his accurate and useful Greek Testament in 1763: and in the 3d edition of his critical conjectures and observations on the New Testament, &c. in 1782, among other things, he conjectures, that the testimony of *the three in heaven* " was by degrees fraudulently " inserted into the text, for proving the Trinity, or else to note " it in the margin of a book by way of interpretation."

" In 1729, was printed in London, by J. Roberts, near the Oxford-Arms, Warwick lane, The New Testament in Greek and English, containing the original text, corrected from the authority of the most authentic manuscripts, and a new version formed agreeably to the illustrations of the most learned commentators and critics, with notes and various readings, and a copious alphabetical index, in two volumes." The editor has intirely omitted this suspected verse, and has justified himself in so doing, in a note upon the place, of some extent, full of great learning upon the subject, and all the information that was then to be had, and written in so agreeable a way and with such distinction and clearness of stile and argument, that it deserves to be drawn out of the obscurity of a note, and printed by itself for general use. " In a word," says he, near the conclusion, " if this *evidence* is not sufficient to prove, that the controverted " text in St. John is *spurious*; by what *evidence* can it be proved, " that any text in St. John is genuine? The authority upon " which *any Greek text* is founded, is only the authority of the " *Greek fathers*, and their authority is founded upon *that* of the " ancient Greek Manuscripts. Now, ALL the Greek fathers, " *not one* excepted; ALL the Greek Manuscripts, the *Irish one*" (written in the 15th or 16th century) " only excepted; ALL the " ancient versions, the old Italic, and St. Jerom's, the Syriac, the " *Aethiopic*, the Arabic, and the Coptic; ALL the ancient Latin fa- " thers, and the most ancient Latin Manuscripts of the New Testa- " ment, do unanimously *exclaim* against the controverted *text*."

The learned Dr. Wall, in his Critical notes on the New Testament, published after his death in 1730, has the following note on 1 John v. 7. " This verse is in no Greek M.S. nor " was in the bibles of antient christians, nor ever made use of " by them in their disputes with the *Arians*. Mill has so de- " fended it, that he who thought it genuine before will now " conclude it to have been interpolated by some Latin scribe first."

Dr. Doddridge, with all his fears and prejudices, has inserted the following note upon this suspected verse, in his *Family Ex-*  

U  
*positor*.

that they are much more numerous in the book of *The Acts*, than the four gospels. This might naturally be expected from the interpretation advanced above,

*poster.* "As it would be altogether unfit, to introduce into such short notes as these are intended to be, a critical dissertation upon the authority of this celebrated text; I shall content myself with referring to what so many learned persons as have engaged in the controversy, have written on each side; but I thought myself obliged to intimate such a remaining doubt at least, concerning it's authenticity, as I have done by inclosing it in crotchets. I am persuaded the words contain an important truth; but whether they have been added by some, or omitted by others, contrary to the original copy, I will not pretend to determine." In the "new translation of the New Testament, extracted from the Doctor's paraphrase after his death, and printed in London, 1765, I observe the dubious passage, to be faithfully inclosed in crotchets.

Dr. Benson in his paraphrase and notes upon the first epistle of St. John, says, concerning this suspected passage. "It appears to me to have been inserted into this epistle, some hundred years after the death of St. John. And therefore I have left it out of the text." And this opinion he supports by a valuable dissertation annexed concerning the genuineness of 1 John v. 7. 8.

In 1764 was printed for Doddsley in Pall mall, "The New Testament, carefully collated with the Greek, and corrected, divided and pointed, according to the various subjects treated of by the inspired writers, with the common division into chapters and verses in the margin, and illustrated with notes critical and explanatory, by Richard Wynne, A. M, Rector of St. Alphage, London," in two volumes. Upon the passage in question, there is the following note. "The 7th verse is omitted in the *Alexandrian*, and in all the Greek MSS. before the 16th century; nor is it to be found in any of the ancient versions, except the Latin, from which the *Complutensians* translated it into Greek, and inserted it into their Bible. I have therefore distinguished it by the Italic character, and included it in crotchets, as it is presumed to be an interpolation."

It is much to be lamented, that the passage thus held dubious or reprobated by many judicious and learned writers, and marked at the beginning of the Reformation in our English Bibles as of suspected authority, should have been admitted, and in the face of increasing evidence against it, have continued to be printed, as a genuine part of Scripture, for more than 200 years; and the unsuspecting English reader thereby imposed upon, in having a manifest interpolation, or, (if Dr. Griesbach's conjecture be well

above, and tends to corroborate it; as St. Luke, in that his second treatise, relates the first pouring out of the promised *holy spirit* or divine power upon the apostles; and afterwards gives a history of things, during the period, in which that divine power was dispensed and communicated to others of Christ's followers, by the instrumentality of the apostles.

Obs. IV. The last clause of this valedictory blessing of the apostle, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. being proved not to relate to a supposed Divine Person called *the holy spirit*, but to the divine power extraordinary, which was imparted to christians in the first age of the gospel, it reflects light upon, and confirms the like interpretation above given of *the holy spirit*, in the baptismal form, Matt. xxviii. 19. viz. that the baptizing persons *into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*, implied only the initiating of them into that religion, which Jesus taught by authority from the supreme Father of all, and which was confirmed by the miraculous gifts of *the holy spirit*, i. e. of an extraordinary divine power.

One

well founded) in having the not very honest addition of one Vigilius Tapfenis, who lived about 500 years after Christ, palmed upon him for the pure word of God.

I cannot conclude this long note, without observing, in respect of a recent attempt to defend the authenticity of this suspected verse, 1 John. v. 7. in "Letters to Edward Gibbon Esq. author of the history of the decline and fall of the Roman empire, by George Travis, A. M. dedicated to Bp. Porteus: 1. that it is not the way to conciliate unbelievers, and men of sense and learning, like Mr. Gibbon, to the christian faith, by never shewing any willingness to give up whatever has been once established, however poorly supported, but everlastingly to maintain it one way or other: and 2. that though there is no end of cavil and making objections in a subject of such wide extent, and so open to it; yet the evidence of the spuriousness of the verse contended for, is so strong and accumulated, as it lies in the collections of Mill, Bengelius, Wetstein, Griesbach, relating to it; that one cannot but wonder at so remarkable a publication in the present day, especially as upon a bare cast of the eye upon it, which is all there has been time for, the author professes not to have made use of any materials, which had not been before these critics, particularly the last, who has so lately given such a decided condemnation of this controverted text.



One cannot help remarking here; how void of all just foundation in the Scriptures, is the doctrine of what is called *three persons in the godhead*, in the uncouth language of the schools; or, of what is termed, *Trinity in Unity*, in the creed given to Athanasius! For the only passages in the sacred writings, that with any degree of plausibility can be drawn to favour it, are these two passages, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. and Matt. xxviii. 19. and the spurious text 1 John v. 7. which last, one should imagine, will never more be cited and countenanced by any learned man, who has any value for his own estimation and character. It is also well known to all conversant in ecclesiastical antiquity, that the first corruption of the Divine Unity, and deviation from the truth taught by the holy Jesus, that *the Father* (his *Father* and his *God*) *was the only true God*: John xvii. 3. xx. 17. was by introducing *a duality into the Godhead*, if we may adopt the barbarous scholastic language; by placing the humble Jesus on a level of equality with the supreme Father. The assumption of the holy spirit into the godhead, and making the Divine Being to consist of three Persons, was of much later date.

Obs. V. If the interpretation above given of this farewell benediction of the apostle, be rightly founded; it follows, that it cannot now be used at the conclusion of public worship; in the sense in which it was uttered by the apostle, as wishing all present may be made partakers of miraculous gifts and powers; for these have been withdrawn for many ages, nor are ever more to be expected. There lie no such exceptions to that valedictory form commonly used by our apostle, but it may with great propriety be adopted at present, as expressive of those sentiments and desires, with which we should depart impressed, from our assemblies for social christian worship; namely, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with us all. Amen.* Rom. xvi. 24. The Scriptures also abound with other forms, equally solemn and proper for the occasion.

SOSIPATER.

P. S. NEPIODIDASCALOS is received.

---

# COMMENTARIES

AND

ESSAYS.

NUMBER III.

---

VII.

A NEW TRANSLATION OF ISAIAH, I—XII;  
WITH NOTES, SUPPLEMENTARY TO  
THOSE OF DR. LOWTH, BISHOP OF  
LONDON, AND CONTAINING REMARKS  
ON SOME PARTS OF HIS TRANSLATION  
AND NOTES.

"QUANDO NIHIL AUGUSTIUS AUT MAGNIFICENTIUS ANIMO  
POSSIT OBVERSARI QUAM DEI O. M. HOMINES ALLO-  
QUENTIS IMAGO, ITA DE VERBIS SANCTISSIMÆ ILLIUS  
VOLUNTATIS NUNCIIS MEDITARI, AD INTIMOS EORUM  
SENSUS PENETRARE, TENEBRAS QUIBUS HOMINUM  
ERRORE IMPLICATA FUERINT DISCUTERE, EAQUE IPSA  
IN SUA LUCE COLLOCARE, HÆC EA MENTIS EXER-  
CITATIO EST, QUA NULLA AUT IMMORTALI EJUS  
NATURA DIGNIOR, AUT IPSI GRATIOR EST AUT  
JUCUNDIOR." LINGUÆ HEBRAICÆ STUDIUM COM-  
MENDATUM ORAT. OXON. HABIT. A.D. MDCCLXXX,  
A GEORGIO JUBB, S. T. P.

X

THE

I. 1. THE VISION OF ISAIAH THE SON OF  
 AMOTS, WHICH HE SAW CONCERNING JU-  
 DAH AND JERUSALEM; IN THE DAYS OF  
 UZZIAH, JOTHAM, AHAZ, HEZEKIAH, KINGS  
 OF JUDAH.

2. HEAR, O heavens, and give ear, O earth:  
 For JEHOVAH is speaking.

I have begotten and brought up children;  
 And even they have revolted from me.

3. The ox knoweth his owner;  
 And the ass his master's crib.

But Israel knoweth not me;  
 Neither doth my people consider.

4. AH, sinful nation! a people laden with  
 iniquity!

A race of evil-doers! children degenerate!

They have forsaken JEHOVAH;

They have rejected with disdain the holy One of  
 Israel;

They have estranged themselves from him.

5. On what part shall ye be smitten, if ye re-  
 peat revolt?

The whole head is sick, and the whole heart  
 faint:

6. From the sole of the foot even to the head,  
 there is no soundness therein;

It is wound, and bruise, and putrifying sore:

It hath not been pressed, nor bound;

Nor hath it been softened with ointment.

7. Your country is desolate, your cities are burnt  
 with fire;

Your land, before your eyes strangers devour it:

And it is become desolate, as if destroyed by an  
 inundation.

And



8. And the daughter of Sion is left, as a shed  
in a vineyard ;  
As a lodge in a garden of cucumbers, as a city  
taken by siege.
9. Had not JEHOVAH, God of hosts, left to us a  
remnant,  
We had soon become as Sodom; we had been  
like to Gomorrah.
10. Hear the word of JEHOVAH, O ye princes of  
Sodom !  
Give ear to the law of our God, O ye people  
of Gomorrah !
11. WHAT have I to do with the multitude  
of your sacrifices ? saith JEHOVAH :  
I am cloyed with the burnt-offerings of rams,  
and the fat of fed beasts ;  
And in the blood of bullocks, and of lambs,  
and of goats, I have no delight.
12. When ye come to appear before me,  
Who hath required this at your hands ?
13. Tread my courts no more ; bring no more  
a vain oblation :  
Incense ! it is an abomination to me.  
The new moon, and the sabbath, and the as-  
sembly proclaimed,  
I cannot endure ; the fast, and the day of restraint.  
14. Your months, and your solemnities, I hate :  
They are a burden on me ; I am weary of bear-  
ing them.
15. When ye spread forth your hands, I will  
hide my eyes from you ;  
Even when ye multiply prayer, I will not hear ;  
For your hands are full of blood.
16. Wash ye yourselves ; be ye clean ; remove far  
away

back The evil of your doings from before my eyes :

17. Cease to do evil ; learn to do well ;

Seek judgment ; deliver the oppressed ;

Do justice to the fatherless ; defend the cause of the widow.

18. Come now, and let us settle the affair, saith  
JEHOVAH :

Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be  
white as snow ;

And though they be red as crimson, they shall  
be as wool.

19. If ye be willing and obedient,  
Ye shall eat the good of the land ;

20. But if ye refuse, and be rebellious,

The sword of the enemy shall devour you :

For the mouth of JEHOVAH hath pronounced it.

21. HOW is the faithful city become a harlot ;  
Sion, who was full of judgment !

Righteousness dwelled in her ; but now mur-  
derers.

22. Thy silver is become dross ; thy wine is mixed  
with water :

23. Thy princes are rebellious, associates of rob-  
bers ;

Every one of them loveth a gift, and seeketh  
rewards :

To the fatherless they administer not justice ;

And the cause of the widow cometh not before  
them.

24. THEREFORE thus saith the Lord, JE-  
HOVAH, God of hosts, the mighty One  
of Israel :

Aha ! I will be eased of my adversaries ;  
I will be avenged on my enemies.

25. And I will bring again my hand over thee :

And

- And I will purge in the furnace thy dross;  
And I will remove all thy alloy.
26. And I will restore thy judges, as at the first;  
And thy counsellors, as at the beginning.  
And afterwards thou shalt be called,  
The city of righteousness, the faithful metropolis.
27. Sion shall be redeemed in judgment,  
And her captives in mercy.
28. But the revolvers and the sinners shall be broken together;  
And they who forsake JEHOVAH shall be consumed.
29. For ye shall be ashamed of the ilexes, which ye have desired;  
And ye shall blush for the gardens, which ye have chosen:
30. When ye shall be as an ilex, whose leaves are blasted;  
And as a garden, wherein is no water.
31. And the strong man shall become tow, and his work a blaze;  
And they shall burn together, and none shall quench them.

II. I. THE WORD, WHICH WAS REVEALED  
TO ISAIAH, THE SON OF AMOTS, CONCERNING JUDAH AND JERUSALEM.

2. IT shall come to pass in the latter days;  
The mountain of the house of JEHOVAH shall be established on the top of the mountains;  
And it shall be exalted above the hills:  
And all nations shall come to it.
3. And many peoples shall go, and shall say;  
Come



Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of  
JEHOVAH;

To the house of the God of Jacob;

And he will teach us of his ways;

And we will walk in his paths.

For from Sion shall go forth the law;

And the word of JEHOVAH from Jerusalem.

4. And he shall judge among the nations;

And shall work conviction in many peoples:

And they shall beat their swords into plough-  
shares;

And their spears into pruning-hooks:

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation;

Neither shall they learn war any more.

5. O HOUSE of Jacob, come ye,

And let us walk in the light of JEHOVAH!

6. VERILY thou hast abandoned thy people,  
the house of Jacob;

Because they are filled with diviners more than  
the east;

And with soothsayers as the Philistines;

And they multiply a spurious brood of strange  
children.

7. And his land is filled with silver and gold;

And there is no end to his treasures:

And his land is filled with horses;

Neither is there any end to his chariots.

8. And his land is filled with idols;

He boweth himself down to the work of his  
hands;

To that which his fingers have made.

9. Therefore shall the mean man be bowed down,  
and the mighty man shall be humbled;

And thou wilt not forgive them.

10. Go

10. GO into the rock, and hide thyself in the dust;  
From the fear of JEHOVAH, and from the glory of his majesty;  
When he shall arise to strike the land with terror.
11. The lofty eyes of men shall be humbled;  
The highth of mortals shall bow down:  
And JEHOVAH alone shall be exalted in that day.
12. For the day of JEHOVAH, God of hosts, is against every thing great and lofty;  
And against every thing which is exalted; and it shall be humbled.
13. Even against all the cedars of Lebanon, the high and the exalted;  
And against all the oaks of Basan;
14. And against all the mountains, the high ones;  
And against all the hills, the exalted ones;
15. And against every tower, high-raised.  
And against every mound, strongly fortified;
16. And against all the ships of Tarshish;  
And against every lovely work of art.
17. And the pride of man shall bow down;  
And the highth of mortals shall be humbled;  
And JEHOVAH alone shall be exalted in that day:
18. And the idols shall totally disappear.
19. And they shall go into caverns of rocks, and into holes of the dust;  
From the fear of JEHOVAH, and from the glory of his majesty;  
When he shall arise to strike the land with terror.
20. In that day shall a man cast away his idols of silver;

And

And his idols of gold, which he shall have made  
to worship ;

To the moles and to the bats :

21. To go into caves of the rocks, and into clefts  
of the craggy rocks ;

From the fear of JEHOVAH, and from the glory  
of his majesty ;

When he shall arise to strike the land with ter-  
ror.

III. 1. For behold, the Lord, JEHOVAH, God of hosts,  
Removeth from Jerusalem, and from Judah,  
Every stay and support ;

The whole stay of bread, and the whole stay of  
water ;

2. The mighty man, and the warrior ;  
The judge, and the prophet, and the diviner,  
and the sage ;

3. The ruler of fifty, and the honorable person ;  
And the counsellor, and the skilful artist, and  
the powerful in persuasion.

4. And I will make boys their princes ;  
And infants shall rule over them.

5. And the people shall be oppressed, one man by  
another :

And every man shall behave insolently towards  
his neighbour ;

The boy towards the old man, and the base to-  
wards the honorable.

6. Therefore shall a man take his brother, of his  
father's house, by the garment ;

Saying ; come, and be thou ruler over us ;  
And let thy hand support our ruinous state.

7. Then shall he openly declare, saying ;  
I will not be the healer of your breaches ;

For in my house is neither bread, nor raiment ;  
Appoint not me ruler of the people.

8. For Jerusalem tottereth, and Judah falleth ;

Because



Because their tongues, and their hands are  
against JEHOVAH;

To provoke by their disobedience the cloud of  
his glory.

9. The steadfastness of their countenances witnesseth against them;  
For their sin, as Sodom, they publish, they hide  
it not.

Wo to them! because they have devised evil  
against themselves;

10. Saying; let us destroy the just One, for he is  
of no use to us.

Therefore the fruits of their deeds shall they  
eat.

11. Wo to the sinner! evil, according to the de-  
serving of his hands, shall be done to him.

12. As to my people, children are their oppressors;  
And women bear rule over them.

O my people, thy leaders cause thee to err,  
And pervert the way of thy paths.

13. JEHOVAH ariseth to plead his cause;  
He standeth up to contend with his people.

14. JEHOVAH will meet in judgment,  
The elders of his people, and their princes:  
As to you, ye have consumed my vineyard;  
The plunder of the poor is in your houses.

15. What mean ye, that ye crush my people,  
And grind the faces of the poor?

16. Thus saith JEHOVAH, God of hosts;  
Because the daughters of Sion are haughty;  
And walk displaying the neck,  
And falsely setting off their eyes with paint;  
Mincing their steps as they go,  
And with their feet lightly tripping along.

17. Therefore will JEHOVAH humble the head of  
the daughters of Sion;

Y

And

And JEHOVAH will expose their nakedness.

18. In that day will JEHOVAH take from them the  
ornaments,  
Of the feet-rings, and the net-works, and the  
crescents;

19. The pendants, and the bracelets, and the thin  
veils;

20. The tires, and the fetters, and the zones,  
And the perfume-boxes, and the amulets;

21. The rings, and the jewels of the nostrils;

22. The embroidered robes, and the tunics;  
And the cloaks, and the little purses;

23. The transparent garments, and the fine linen  
vests;

And the turbans, and the mantles.

24. And thou [O Sion] shalt have, instead of per-  
fume, a putrid ulcer;

And, instead of well-girt raiment, rags;

And, instead of high-dressed hair, baldness;

And, instead of a zone, a girdle of sackcloth.

These things shalt thou have instead of beauty;

25. Thy people shall fall by the sword;  
And thy mighty men in the battle.

26. And thy doors shall lament and mourn;

And desolate shalt thou sit on the ground.

IV. 1. And seven women shall take hold on one man  
in that day;

Saying, our own bread will we eat,

And with our own garments will we be clothed;

Only let us be called by thy name;

Take away our reproach.

2. In that day shall the branch of JEHOVAH  
Become glorious and honorable;

And the produce of the land excellent and  
beautiful,

For

For the escaped of the house of Israel:

3. And it shall come to pass; whosoever shall be  
left in Sion,

And shall remain in Jerusalem,

Holy shall he be called;

Every one who shall be written for life in Jerusalem.

4. Since JEHOVAH will wash away the filth of the  
sons and daughters of Sion;

And the blood of Jerusalem he will remove  
from the midst of her;

By a spirit of judgment, and by a spirit of  
burning.

5. Then shall JEHOVAH create on the station of  
mount Sion,

And on all her holy assemblies,

A cloud by day and smoke;

And the brightness of a flaming fire by night:

Yea, over all shall the glory be a covering.

6. And a tabernacle it shall be, for shade from the  
heat;

And for a covert, and a refuge, from storm  
and rain.

V. 1. I WILL sing now to my beloved,

A song of loves concerning my vineyard.

I have a vineyard on a fruitful hill:

2. And I made a fence about it, and I cleared it  
from the stones;

And I planted it with the vine of Sorek;

And I built a tower in the midst of it;

And I hewed out also a lake therein:

And I expected that it should bring forth

grapes;

But it brought forth poisonous berries.

Y 2

3. And



3. And now, O inhabitants of Jerusalem, and men of Judah,  
Judge, I pray you, between me and my vineyard:  
4. What could have been done more to my vineyard,  
Than I have done in it?  
Why, when I expected that it should bring forth grapes,  
Brought it forth poisonous berries?  
5. But come now, and I will make known to you,  
What I purpose to do to my vineyard:  
To remove it's hedge, and it shall be devoured;  
To destroy it's fence, and it shall be trodden down.  
6. And I will make it a desolation;  
It shall not be pruned, neither shall it be digged:  
But the brier and the thorn shall spring up in it;  
And I will command the clouds,  
That they shed no rain on it:  
7. Verily, the vineyard of JEHOVAH, God of hosts,  
is the house of Israel;  
And the men of Judah the plant of his delight:  
And he looked for judgment, but behold tyranny;  
And for righteousness, but behold the cry of the oppressed.  
8. WO to you who join house to house;  
Who lay field to field together;  
Till there be no place, and ye have your dwelling,  
Alone to yourselves, in the midst of the land.  
9. To my ear hath JEHOVAH, God of hosts, revealed it:

Surely

9. Surely many houses shall become a desolation;  
The great and the fair ones, without an inhabitant.

10. Yea ten acres of vineyard shall yield a single bath of wine;

And a chomer of seed shall produce an ephah.

11. Wo to them who rise early in the morning,  
to follow strong drink;

Who sit late in the evening, that wine may inflame them:

12. And the lyre, and the harp, the tabor, and the pipe,

And wine, are their entertainments:

But the work of JEHOVAH they regard not;  
And the operation of his hands they perceive not.

13. Therefore my people goeth into captivity for want of the knowledge of JEHOVAH;

And their nobles have died with hunger;

And their plebeians are parched with thirst.

14. Therefore Hades hath enlarged his appetite;

And hath stretched open his mouth without measure:

And down go her nobility, and her populace;

And her busy throng, and all who exult in her.

15. And the mean man shall be bowed down, and the great man shall be brought low;

And the eyes of the haughty shall be humbled:

16. And JEHOVAH, God of hosts, shall be exalted in judgment;

And God, the holy One, shall be glorified in righteousness.

17. Then shall the sheep feed without restraint;

And the lambs shall depasture the desolate field of the luxurious.

18. Wo

18. Wo to them, who draw out iniquity, as a  
long cable;

And sin, as the thick traces of a waine:

19. Who say, let him make speed, let him hasten  
his work, that we may see it;

And let the counsel of the holy One of Israel  
come to pass, that we may know it.

20. Wo to them who call evil good, and good evil;

Who put darkness for light, and light for  
darkness;

Who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.

21. Wo to them, who are wise in their own eyes,  
And prudent in their own conceit;

22. Wo to them, who are powerful to drink wine;

And men of might to mingle strong drink:

23. Who justify the guilty for reward;

And take away the righteousness of the right-  
eous from him.

24. Therefore as the tongue of fire licketh up the  
stubble,

And as the flame dissolveth the chaff;

So shall their root become as touch-wood,

And their blossom shall go up as the dust;

Because they have despised the law of JEHOVAH,

God of hosts;

And have scornfully rejected the word of the

holy One of Israel.

25. Wherefore the anger of JEHOVAH was kindled

against his people;

And he hath stretched out his hand against

them:

And he smote them, and the mountains trem-

bled;

And their carcases became as dung in the midst

of the streets.

For



- For all this his anger is not turned away ;  
 But his hand is still stretched out.
26. And he will erect a standard for the nations afar  
 off ;  
 And he will lift them from the ends of the  
 earth ;  
 And behold with speed swiftly shall they come.
27. None among them is faint, and none stumbleth ;  
 None shall slumber, nor sleep ;  
 Nor shall the girdle of their loins be loosed ;  
 Nor shall the latchet of their shoes be unbound.
28. Whose arrows are sharpened ;  
 And all their bows are bent ;  
 The hoofs of their horses shall be counted as  
 adamant ;  
 And the wheels of their chariots as a whirl-  
 wind.
29. Their growling is as the growling of the lions ;  
 As the young lions shall they growl.  
 They shall roar, and shall seize the prey ;  
 And they shall bear it away, and none shall re-  
 scue it.
30. In that day shall they roar against them, as the  
 roaring of the sea ;  
 And these shall look up to the heaven, and  
 down to the earth ;  
 And lo ! darkness, distress !  
 And the light obscured by the gloomy vapour !

- VI. 1. IN the year in which Uzziah the king died  
 I saw JEHOVAH sitting on a throne high and  
 lofty ; and the house was full of his glory.  
 Above him stood seraphim : each one of them  
 had six wings ; with two of them he covereth  
 his

his face, with two of them he covereth his feet  
and two of them he useth in flying.

3. And they cried alternately, and said:  
Holy, holy, holy, JEHOVAH, God of hosts !  
The whole earth is full of his glory.

4. And the pillars of the vestibule were shaken by  
the voice of their cry; and the temple was  
filled with smoke.

5. And I said, alas for me !  
I am struck dumb : for I am a man of polluted  
lips, and in the midst of a people of polluted  
lips I dwell; and my eyes have seen the king,

6. JEHOVAH, God of hosts. And one of the seraphim  
came to me flying; and in his hand

was a burning coal, which he had taken with  
7. the tongs from off the altar. And he touched

my mouth, and said:  
Lo ! this hath touched thy lips:

Thy iniquity is removed, and thy sin is expiated.

8. And I heard the voice of JEHOVAH saying; whom  
shall I send, and who will go to this people ?

9. And I said; behold, here am I; send me. And  
he said;

Go, and say thou to this people:  
Hear ye indeed, but understand not;

See ye indeed, but perceive not.

10. For the heart of this people is become gross;  
And their ears are dull, and their eyes they have  
closed;

That they may not see with their eyes, nor hear  
with their ears,

Nor understand with their hearts, and be converted;  
and I may heal them.

11. And I said; how long, O JEHOVAH? And he  
said;

Till

Till cities be laid waste, so that there be no inhabitant ;

And houses, so that there be no man :

And the land be left utterly desolate.

12. Till JEHOVAH remove man far away ;

And there be many a deserted woman in the midst of the land.

13. And though there be a tenth part remaining in it,

Even this shall undergo a repeated destruction ;

Yet, as the ilex, and the oak, though cut down, hath it's stock remaining,

A holy seed shall be the stock of the nation.

- VII. 1. IN the days of Ahaz, the son of Jotham, the son of Uzziah, king of Judah, Retzin, king of Syria, and Pekah, the son of Remaliah, king of Israel, came up against Jerusalem to besiege
2. it ; but they could not overcome it. And when it was told to the house of David, that Syria was supported by Ephraim, the heart of the king, and the heart of his people was moved, as the trees of the forest are moved before the
3. wind. Then said JEHOVAH to Isaiah : go out now to meet Ahaz ; thou and Shearjashub thy son ; at the end of the aqueduct of the upper
4. pool, at the caussay of the Fuller's field ; and thou shalt say to him ;  
Take heed, and be still ; fear not, neither let thy heart be faint ;  
For the two tails of these smoking fire-brands ;  
For the fierce wrath of Retzin, and the son of Remaliah.
5. Because Syria hath devised evil against thee ;  
Ephraim and the son of Remaliah, saying ;

Z

6. Let



6. Let us go up against Judah, and harraſs it ;  
And let us rend off a part of it for ourſelves :  
And let us make the ſon of Tabeal king in the  
miſt of it.
7. Thus ſaith JEHOVAH, God of hoſts ;  
It ſhall not ſtand, neither ſhall it be.
8. Though the head of Syria be Damafcus ;  
And the head of Damafcus, Retſin ;  
And the head of Ephraim be Samaria ;  
And the head of Samaria, Remaliah's ſon :
9. Yet within ſixty and five years,  
Ephraim ſhall be broken from being a people.  
If ye believe not in me, ye ſhall not be eſta-  
bliſhed.
10. And JEHOVAH ſpake yet again to Ahaz, ſay-  
ing ;
11. Aſk for thyſelf a ſign from JEHOVAH, thy God ;  
Aſk it from beneath or from above.
12. And Ahaz ſaid ; I will not aſk, neither will I
13. tempt JEHOVAH. Then he ſaid ;  
Hear ye now, O houſe of David ;  
Is it a ſmall thing with you to weary men ;  
But will ye weary JEHOVAH alſo ?
14. Nevertheless JEHOVAH himſelf will give to you  
a ſign ;  
Behold, the virgin is with child, and is bring-  
ing forth a ſon,  
And thou ſhalt call his name, IMMANUEL.
15. Butter and honey ſhall he eat,  
When he ſhall know to reſute the evil and to  
chooſe the good :
16. For before the child ſhall know,  
To reſute the evil and to chooſe the good ;  
Deprived ſhall be the land, which thou feareſt,  
Of the preſence of both the kings.

17. But

17. But JEHOVAH will bring on thee,  
And on thy people, and on thy father's house,  
Days, such as have not come,  
From the day when Ephraim departed from  
Judah.
18. And it shall come to pass in that day,  
JEHOVAH will hift the fly,  
Which is in the utmost part of the rivers of  
Egypt;  
And the bee, which is in the land of Assyria:
19. And they shall come, and they shall light all of  
them,  
On the desolate vallies, and on the craggy  
rocks,  
And on all the thickets, and on all the caverns.  
In that day JEHOVAH will shave by the hired  
razor,
20. By the people beyond the river, by the king of  
Assyria,  
The head and the hair of the feet;  
And even the beard itself shall be destroyed.
21. And it shall come to pass in that day,  
That if a man shall feed a cow and two sheep,
22. From the plenty of milk, which they shall pro-  
duce, he shall eat butter;  
Even butter and honey shall he eat,  
Whosoever shall be left in the midst of the land.
23. And every vineyard having a thousand vines,  
Valued at a thousand pieces of silver,  
Shall become in that day briers and thorns.
24. With arrows and with the bow shall they come  
thither;  
For the whole land shall become briers and  
thorns.
25. And all the hills, which were dressed with the  
mattock,

Where the fear of briars and thorns never came,  
 Shall be for the range of the ox, and for the  
 treading of sheep.

- VIII. 1. AND JEHOVAH said to me; take to thee a large mirror, and write on it with a workman's graving tool, To hasten the spoil, to take quickly  
 2. the prey: And I called to me for a testimony faithful witnesses, Uriah the priest, and Zachariah the son of Jeberechiah. And I approached to the prophets; and she conceived, and bare  
 3. a son. And JEHOVAH said to me; call his name Maher-shalal, hath-baz;  
 For before the child shall know  
 To pronounce, My father and my mother,  
 The riches of Damascus shall be borne away,  
 And the spoil of Samaria, before the king of  
 Assyria.  
 5. And JEHOVAH spake yet again to me, saying;  
 6. Because this people hath rejected  
 The waters of Siloah, which flow gently;  
 And rejoiceth in Retzin, and the son of Remaliah:  
 7. Therefore behold, JEHOVAH bringeth on them  
 The waters of the river, the strong and the  
 mighty;  
 Even the king of Assyria, and all his force.  
 And he shall rise above all their channels,  
 And shall go over all their banks.  
 8. And he shall pass through Judah, overflowing  
 and spreading,  
 Even to the neck shall he reach:  
 And the extent of his camp shall be  
 Over the full breadth of thy land, O IM-  
 MANUEL.

9. Associate



9. Associate yourselves, O ye peoples, and be dismayed;  
And give ear, all ye of distant lands:  
Gird yourselves, and be dismayed; gird yourselves, and be dismayed.
10. Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought;  
Speak the word, and it shall not stand:  
For IMMANUEL.
11. (Thus said JEHOVAH to me;  
As taking me by the hand he instructed me,  
That I should not walk in the way of this people,
12. Saying, Say ye not, It is holy,  
Of every thing of which this people shall say,  
It is holy:  
And fear ye not their fear, neither be ye terrified.
13. JEHOVAH, God of hosts, sanctify ye him;  
And let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.)
14. And he shall be to the nations for sanctification:  
But for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence,  
To two of the houses of Israel;  
For a trap, and for a snare, to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.
15. And many among them shall stumble,  
And shall fall, and be broken; and shall be ensnared, and caught.
16. And he will say; bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples:
17. And I will wait for JEHOVAH, who hideth his face  
From the house of Jacob; and I will look to him.

18. Behold

18. Behold, I, and the children,  
Whom God hath given to me.  
And there shall be signs and wonders in Israel,  
From JEHOVAH, God of hosts,  
Who dwelleth in the mountain of Sion.
19. And when they shall say to you;  
Seek to the necromancers and the wizards;  
To them who speak inwardly, and who mutter;  
Should not a people seek to their God?  
Should they seek concerning the living to the  
dead?
20. To the law and to the testimony, let them seek:  
If they will not speak according to this word,  
In which there is no obscurity;
21. Every one of them shall pass through the land  
distressed and famished;  
And when he shall be famished, and angry with  
himself;  
He shall curse his king and his God.
22. And he shall cast his eyes upwards, and look  
down to the earth;  
And lo! distress and darkness!  
Gloom, tribulation and accumulated darkness!
23. BUT there is no darkness in the land which  
was distressed:  
In the former time he debased  
The land of Zebulon and the land of Napthali;  
But in the latter time he hath made them glo-  
rious;  
Even the way of the sea, along the Jordan, Ga-  
lilee of the nations.
- IX. 1. The people which walked in darkness,  
Have seen a great light;  
They who dwelled in the land and shadow of  
death,

To

To them hath the light shined.

2. Thou hast multiplied the nation, thou hast increased their joy :

They rejoice before thee, as with the joy of harvest ;

As they rejoice, who divide the spoil.

3. For the yoke of his burden, the staff laid on his shoulder,

The rod of his oppressor hast thou broken, as in the day of Midian.

4. For the greaves of the armed warrior in the conflict,

And the garment rolled in much blood,  
Shall be for a burning, even fuel for the fire.

5. For to us a child is born, to us a son is given ;  
And the government shall be on his shoulder :  
And his name shall be called, The Messenger of the great design ;

The Father of the age ; The Prince of peace.

6. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end ;

On the throne of David, and on his kingdom ;  
To fix it, and to establish it ;

With judgment and with justice, henceforth and for ever.

The zeal of JEHOVAH, God of hosts, will do this,

7. JEHOVAH hath sent a word against Jacob ;  
And it hath lighted on Israel.

8. Because the people, all of them, carry themselves haughtily ;

Ephraim, and the inhabitant of Samaria ;

In pride and arrogancē of heart, saying ;

9. The bricks are fallen, but we will build with hewn stone ;

The



- The sycamores are cut down, but we will replace them with cedars.
10. Therefore will JEHOVAH excite the princes of Retzin against him;  
And raise up his enemies together;
11. The Syrians from the east, and the Philistines from the west;  
And they shall devour Israel on every side.  
For all this his anger is not turned away;  
But his hand is still stretched out.
12. Yet this people have not turned to him who smote them;  
And JEHOVAH, God of hosts, they have not sought.
13. Therefore will JEHOVAH cut off from Israel the head and the tail;  
The branch and the rush in one day.
14. The aged, and the honorable person, he is the head;  
And the prophet, who teacheth falsehood, he is the tail.
15. For the leaders of this people lead them astray;  
And they who are led by them shall be devoured.
16. Wherefore JEHOVAH will not rejoice over their young men;  
And on their orphans, and their widows, he will have no compassion.  
For every one of them is a hypocrite and an evil-doer;  
And every mouth speaketh folly.  
For all this his anger is not turned away;  
But his hand is still stretched out.
17. For wickedness burneth as a fire;  
The brier and the bramble it shall consume;  
And

And it shall kindle the thicket of the wood :  
And shall mount up in volumes of rising  
smoke.

18. Through the wrath of JEHOVAH, God of hosts,  
is the land darkened ;

And the people shall be as fuel for the fire.

A man shall not spare his brother ;

19. But he shall snatch on the right, and yet be  
hungry ;

And he shall devour on the left, and not be  
satisfied :

Every man shall devour the flesh of his neigh-  
bour.

20. Manasseh shall devour Ephraim, and Ephraim  
Manasseh ;

And both of them shall be united against  
Judah.

For all this his anger is not turned away ;

But his hand is still stretched out.

X. 1. Wo to them, who decree unrighteous de-  
crees ;

To the scribes, who act wickedly in drawing  
up decrees :

2. To turn aside the needy from judgment ;

To rob of their right the poor of my people :

That the widows may become their prey ;

And that they may plunder the orphans.

3. And what will ye do in the day of visitation ?

And in the day of desolation, which shall come  
from afar ?

To whom will ye flee for succour ?

And where will ye deposit your wealth ?

4. Without me, they shall bow down under the  
bounden,

And under the slain they shall fall.

A a

For

For all this his anger is not turned away ;  
But his hand is still stretched out.

5. HO ! to the Assyrian ; the rod of my anger,  
And the staff of my indignation, is in his hand.
6. Against a dissembling nation will I send him ;  
And against a people, the object of my wrath,  
will I give him a charge :  
To gather the spoil and to bear away the  
prey ;  
And to trample them under foot as the mire  
of the streets.
7. But he doth not so purpose ;  
And his heart doth not so intend :  
But to destroy is in his heart ;  
And to cut off nations not a few.
8. For he saith ; Are not my princes altogether  
kings ?
9. Is not Calno as Carchemish ?  
Is not Hamath as Arphad ?  
Is not Samaria as Damascus ?
10. As my hand hath seized the kingdoms of the  
idols ;  
Whose graven images were superior to those  
of Samaria and Jerusalem ;
11. As I have done to Samaria and her idols,  
Shall I not likewise do to Jerusalem and her  
images ?
12. But it shall be, when JEHOVAH shall have  
accomplished his whole work,  
On mount Sion, and on Jerusalem :  
I will punish the effect of the proud heart of  
the king of Assyria ;  
And the triumphant look of his haughty eyes.  
For he hath said, By the strength of my hand  
have I done it ;

And



- And by my wisdom; for I am endued with  
prudence;  
I have removed the bounds of the peoples;  
And I have plundered their hoarded treasures;  
And I have brought down those, who were  
strongly seated.
14. And my hand hath found, as a nest, the  
riches of the peoples:  
And as one gathereth eggs deserted,  
So have I made a general gathering of the  
earth:  
And there was no one, which moved the  
wing;  
Which opened the beak, or which chirped.
15. Shall the ax boast itself against him who  
heweth therewith?  
Shall the saw magnify itself against him who  
moveth it?  
As if the rod should wield him who lifteth it;  
As if the staff should lift up it's master.
16. Wherefore JEHOVAH, God of hosts, shall send  
on his fat ones leanness;  
And under his glory he shall kindle a burn-  
ing as of a conflagration.
17. And the light of Israel shall become a fire,  
And his holy One a flame;  
And he shall burn, and consume his thorn,  
And his brier in one day.
18. Even the glory of his forest, and of his fruit-  
ful field,  
From the soul even to the flesh, he will con-  
sume;  
And it shall be as when fleeth out of the fire.
19. And the remainder of the trees of his forest  
shall be a small number,  
So that a child may write them down.

20. And it shall come to pass in that day,  
No more shall the remnant of Israel,  
And the escaped of the house of Jacob,  
Lean on him, who smote them:  
But they shall lean on JEHOVAH,  
The holy One of Israel, in truth.
21. A remnant shall return, a remnant of Jacob,  
to God the mighty One.
22. For though the number of the children of  
Israel be as the sand of the sea,  
Yet a remnant of them only shall return.
23. For an account, perfecting it and cutting it  
short in righteousness,  
Will JEHOVAH, God of hosts, take in the  
midst of the land.
24. Wherefore thus saith JEHOVAH, God of hosts;  
Fear not, O my people, who dwellest in Sion,  
because of the Assyrian;  
With his staff indeed he shall smite thee,  
And his rod shall he lift up against thee, in  
the way of Egypt.
25. But yet a very little time, and my indignation  
shall cease;  
And my anger in their destruction :-
26. And JEHOVAH, God of hosts, will raise up  
against him a scourge,  
As the stroke on Midian at the rock of Oreb,  
And as the rod which he lifted up over the  
sea;  
Yea he will lift it up, after the manner of  
Egypt.
27. And it shall come to pass in that day;  
His burden shall be removed from off thy  
shoulder,  
And his yoke from off thy neck:

Yea,

Yea, the yoke shall perish from off your shoulders.

28. He is come to Aiath; he hath passed to Migron;

At Michmas he will deposite his baggage.

29. They have passed the strait; Geba is their lodging for the night:

Ramah is frightened; Gibeah of Saul fleeth.

30. Cry aloud with thy voice, O daughter of Gallim;

Hearken to her, O Laish; answer her, O Anathoth.

31. Madmena is gone away; the inhabitants of Gebim flee amain.

32. Yet this day shall he abide in Nob:

He shall shake his hand against the mount of the daughter of Sion;

Against the hill of Jerusalem.

33. Behold, the Lord, JEHOVAH, God of hosts,

Will lop the flourishing branch with a dreadful crash;

And the high of stature shall be cut down,

And the lofty shall be brought low:

34. And he will hew the thickets of the forest with iron,

And Lebanon shall fall by a mighty hand.

XI. 1. But there shall spring forth a rod from the trunk of Jesse;

And a cion from his roots shall become fruitful.

2. And the spirit of JEHOVAH shall rest on him;

The spirit of wisdom, and understanding;

The spirit of counsel, and strength;

The spirit of the knowledge and fear of JEHOVAH:

3. And



3. And he shall be of quick discernment in the  
fear of JEHOVAH:  
So that not according to the sight of his eyes  
shall he judge;  
Nor according to the hearing of his ears shall  
he reprove.
4. But with righteousness shall he judge the poor,  
And with equity shall he work conviction in  
the meek of the land.  
And he shall smite the land with the blast of  
his mouth;  
And with the breath of his lips he shall slay  
the wicked one.
5. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his  
loins;  
And faithfulness the cincture of his reins.
6. Then shall the wolf take up his abode with  
the lamb;  
And the leopard shall lie down with the kid:  
And the calf, and the young lion, and the  
fatling shall come together;  
And a little child shall lead them.
7. And the heifer, and the she-bear shall feed  
together;  
Together shall their young ones lie down;  
And the lion shall eat straw as the ox.
8. And the suckling shall play on the hole of  
the aspic;  
And on the den of the basilisk shall the new-  
weaned child lay his hand.
9. They shall not hurt, nor destroy, in all my  
holy mountain;  
For the earth shall be full of the knowledge  
of JEHOVAH,  
As the waters cover the depths of the sea.
10. And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse;  
And

And he who shall rise to reign over the nations,

In him shall the nations hope,

And his resting-place shall be glorious.

17. And it shall come to pass in that day;

JEHOVAH will again the second time put forth his hand,

To recover the remnant of his people;

Which shall remain, from Assyria, and from Egypt;

And from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam;

And from Shinear, and from Hamath, and from the western regions.

12. And he will lift up a signal to the nations;

And he will gather the out-casts of Israel,

And the dispersed of Judah will he collect,

From the four extremities of the earth.

13. And the jealousy of Ephraim shall cease;

And the enmity of Judah shall be no more:

Ephraim shall not be jealous of Judah;

And Judah shall not be at enmity with Ephraim.

14. But they shall invade the borders of the Philistines westward;

Together shall they spoil the children of the east;

On Edom and Moab they shall lay their hand;

And the sons of Ammon shall obey them.

15. As JEHOVAH smote with a drought the tongue of the Egyptian sea;

So will he shake his hand over the river with his vehement wind:

And he will strike it into seven streams,

And will make it passable for them on foot.

16. And

16. And there shall be a high-way for the remnant  
of his people ;  
Which shall remain from Assyria :  
As it was to Israel,  
In the day when he came up from the land  
of Egypt.

- XII.** 1. And in that day thou shalt say ;  
I will give thanks to thee, O JEHOVAH ; for  
whereas thou hast been angry with me,  
Thy anger is turned away, and thou hast  
comforted me.
2. Behold, God is my salvation ;  
I will trust, and will not be afraid :  
For my strength, and my song, is JEHOVAH ;  
And he is become to me salvation.
3. And when ye shall draw water with joy from  
the fountains of salvation ; in that day ye shall  
say ;
4. Give ye thanks to JEHOVAH ; call on his  
name ;  
Make known among the peoples his mighty  
works :  
Record ye, how highly his name is exalted.
5. Sing ye JEHOVAH ; for he hath wrought a  
stupendous work :  
This is made manifest in all the earth.  
Cry aloud, and shout for joy, O inhabiters of  
Sion ;  
For great in the midst of thee is the holy One  
of Israel.

NOTES.



## N O T E S.

## CHAP. I.

2. **FOR JEHOVAH is speaking.]** This is an exact translation of the original; and this and the preceding line are, I think, the words of God himself, and not as bishop Lowth supposeth, of the prophet, as herald, or officer to proclaim the summons to the court, calling on all created beings, celestial and terrestrial to attend." "There seems, saith the bishop, to be an impropriety in demanding attention to a speech already delivered." Bishop Coverdale's version in 1550 is not chargeable with this impropriety. It is thus, "For the Lorde SPEAK-ETH." Subsequent translators have, on many occasions, very injudiciously varied from this ancient version.

**Ibid. I have begotten—]** Bishop Lowth seems to prefer the reading of the LXX לְבָרִיתִי to the common reading גְּדַלְתִּי, *I have nourished*; a word, as he observes, little differing from the other: but he hath not adopted it in his translation. I think it to be clearly right; and *γεννησα* is proved to be the genuine version of the LXX by Tertullian, who in many parts of his writings. p. 130. 185. 400. 404. 472. cites the old latin version *GENUI*. See many similar expressions collected, and the reason of them explained in Dr. Taylor's Key, No. 17—24. 99—105.

4. **AH, sinful nation! —]** I take these to be the words of the prophet, by which he expresseth his indignation at the folly and wickedness of

B b

his

his countrymen. The word *us* in the ninth verse, and the words *our God* in the tenth, shew plainly, that those verses could not be uttered by the prophet in the name of God; but they and the five preceding verses may very properly be considered as uttered by him in his own person.

Ibid. They have estranged themselves from him.] Bishop Lowth's translation is, "They are estranged from him; they have turned their backs upon him." The translation which I have given sufficiently expresseth the sense of the original.

5. On what part shall ye be smitten again, if ye repeat revolt?] Bishop Lowth hath well illustrated the expression of the prophet; but his translation is not exact. He supposeth this line, which he renders thus, "On what part will ye strike again, will ye add correction?" to be addressed to the instruments of God's vengeance, where they who or what soever. But this supposition is unnatural; and it is totally unnecessary. The translation which I have given is confirmed by Abendana on Sal. b. Melech cited here by the learned bishop; "There are some, saith he, who explain it thus; *upon what limb shall you be smitten, if you add defection?* For already for your sins have you been smitten upon all of them; so that there is not to be found in you a whole limb, on which you can be smitten." The bishop's criticism on the word סרה, is certainly indefensible. "As, saith he, from דע, דע, knowledge; from עץ, עצה, counsel; from שן, שנה, sleep, &c. so from סר is regularly derived סרה, correction." But this argument

argument from analogy can have no weight, if it be considered, that the noun from *סר* is *מוסר*, which often occurs, and that *סרה* as derived from *סר*, which signifies, *to turn aside from the right path*, is also frequently found. The version of the LXX affords additional support to my translation; *ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ κυρίου*.

9. JEHOVAH, God of hosts——] I think that bishop Lowth is right in considering this title of God *יהוה צבאות*, JEHOVAH of hosts, as an elliptical expression for *יהוה אלהי צבאות*, JEHOVAH, God of hosts. See Kennicott, State of the Hebrew text. i. 525. and Sermon on Isaiah vii. 13—16. p. 69. The Vulgate in Isaiah i. 24. vi. 3. and xxviii. 29. hath Dominus, Deus exercituum, though the word *אלהי* be not now in the original in those places. Grotius on 1 Sam. i. 18. observes, “In Heb. *יהוה צבאות*; “at plus videtur fuisse in codicibus aliis, “Nam LXX vertunt *αυτος ο βασις των ουναντων*.” St. Paul in Rom. ix. 29. citing this verse of Isaiah follows the LXX, and reads *αυτος ο βασις των ουναντων*, without *θεος*; and in the greek language the expression is unexceptionable, *αυτος* not being a proper name. *Lord of hosts*, for the same reason is proper in our language; but if we retain the name JEHOVAH, it is improper to say JEHOVAH of Hosts. “The title of JEHOVAH, “or LORD of hosts, or sabaoth, saith Mr. “Farmer on Miracles. p. 338, does not de- “note *the god of battle*, as those assert it does, “who would degrade the God of Israel to a “level with the heathen god of war, whose “peculiar province it was to preside over bat- “tles. This very magnificent title is given “to God on account of his being the creator



- " and sovereign of all other beings; the monarch, not of some particular people and province, but of the whole universe."
12. ——— at your hands.] Lxx *ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου*. מִיָּדְכֶם should be מִיָּדְכֶם.
13. Tread my courts no more——] Dr. Kennicott in his *Diff. Gen.* sect. 165. concurs with the bishop in approving the version of the Lxx. See Mr. Blayney on Jer. xv. 1, where the expression is very similar.
14. ——— I ———] Heb. וַיִּפֶּשׂ, *my soul*, i. e. I. See my notes on LIII. 10. 12.
16. Lxx. *ἑαυτοῖς*, in the middle voice; *wash ye yourselves*. See Dr. Clarke's note on *Iliad*. iii. 141.
17. אשרו רמון. In rendering this obscure phrase, I think it safest to follow the Lxx, whose version is, *ῥυτίζετε ἀδικήματα*. Bishop Lowth follows Bochart, and renders it, "Amend that which is corrupted," though he be not perfectly satisfied with his explication of it.
18. ——— and let us settle the affair,——] Dr. Taylor in his *Concordance*, R. יָכַח, gives this as the true sense of the original וְיִכְחֶנּוּ in this place, which is, I think, well supported by him. This sense is more suitable to the context than the translation in the English bible, "and let us reason together," or that given by bishop Lowth, "and let us plead together;" and it is more agreeable to the version of the Lxx, which according to the Vatican MS. is *διαλεγόμενοι*, and according to the Alexandrian MS. and the Complutense edition καὶ διαλεγόμενοι, from *διαλέγομαι*, not from *διαλέγομαι*. See their version in Gen. xxxi. 37; and also in Job ix. 33. in the Alexandrian MS. It must be observed, that the

the London Polyglot and L. Bos misrepresent the reading of the Alexandrian MS, but that in Dr. Grabe's edition it is printed as above given. See Wotton's note on Clemens R. c. 8. in p. 37.

Ibid. And though they be red——] For the second  $\text{מן}$  many copies have  $\text{מן}$ , and the LXX have  $\text{ἐν ΔΕ}$ .

20. ——— shall devour you.] The LXX and Vulgate seem to be sufficient authorities for reading  $\text{תאכלנו}$  instead of  $\text{תאכלו}$ .

Ibid. ——— hath pronounced it.] The LXX have  $\text{ἐλάλησεν ΤΑΤΤΑ}$ , and seem to have read  $\text{תאמ}$  after  $\text{דבר}$ . See xxi. 17. xxii. 15. lviii. 14. Micah iv. 4.

21. Sion, who was full of judgment.] The version of the LXX is  $\text{Σιὼν πληρὴ κρίσεως}$ , which seems to be right. This and the two following verses are the words of the prophet.

24. THEREFORE thus saith——]  $\text{כֹּה}$ , thus, ought to be added after  $\text{לֵכֶן}$ , as it is found in x. 24. xxxvii. 33. lxx. 13. and in many places in Jeremiah. The LXX have,  $\text{ΔΙΑΤΕΤΟ ΤΑΔΕ}$ . In Isaiah xlix. 5. the same word  $\text{כֹּה}$  is lost from the text; but it is there supplied by eight MSS. as well as by the LXX, Syr. and Vulg. See the bishop's note.

Ibid. ——— the Lord——] In the original it is  $\text{יהוה}$ , which the LXX here, and in iii. i. and x. 33. have rendered,  $\text{ὁ ΔΙΣΠΟΤΗΣ}$ , i. e. the supreme Lord, or the supreme governour. See Dr. Clarke's Scripture-doctrine, No 15, 407\*. 411. 420. and Answer to Nelson. p. 109.

25. ——— in the furnace ——] The conjecture of Dr. Durell, and archbishop Secker, who would read  $\text{בכר}$  for  $\text{בכר}$ , is confirmed by MS.

MS. No. 153, which hath בבר, and by the various readings in No. 288, the edition of J. H. Michaelis, which have בבר. It is observable, that MS. No 1. in Ezek. xxii. 18, 20, 22. had at first בר three times instead of בבר.

27. And her captives in mercy.] The English bible hath "her converts," שביה being considered as derived from שוב, which signifies, *to return*. I follow bishop Lowth, who derives the word from שבה, which signifies, *to take captive*. This sense is followed by the LXX, whose version is, *ἡ αὐτῆς αἰχμαλωτισμένης*.

28. ——— shall be broken——] For ושביר the LXX read וישביר, which they render κατασφραγίσαι, as in Isaiah viii. 15. and xxviii. 13. The bishop's version is, "but destruction shall fall on;" but as there is nothing in the Hebrew answering to the words "shall fall on" the reading followed by the LXX seems to be right.

31. ——— a blaze.] This seems to be a much more proper translation than the bishop's, "a spark of fire." See Dr. Taylor's Concord. R. 1133. 1854. He explains the prophet thus; "The strong man, who thinks himself firmly established, and proof against all events, shall, in the day of God's vengeance, be for, or become, flax, and his idolatrous work, the very means by which he intended to secure himself, shall be for, shall become" (i. e. shall break out into) a blaze, and they shall both burn together, &c."



## CHAP. II.

Bishop Lowth, in his introduction to his notes on the second, third, and fourth chapters, saith, "That the whole third chapter, with the first verse of the fourth, is a prophecy of the calamities of the Babylonian invasion and captivity, with a particular amplification of the distress of the proud and luxurious daughters of Sion, and that the second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth verses of the fourth chapter promise to the remnant, which shall have escaped this severe purgation, a future restoration to the protection of God." He endeavours to ascertain the time of the delivery of the prophecy; and for that purpose he observes, "That this prophecy was probably delivered in the time of Jotham, or perhaps in that of Uzziah; as Isaiah is said to have prophesied in his reign; to which time not any of his prophecies is so applicable as that of these chapters; that the seventh verse of the second, and the latter part of the third chapter plainly point out times in which riches abounded, and luxury and delicacy prevailed; that plenty of silver and gold could only arise from their commerce, particularly from that part of it, which was carried on by the Red sea; and that this circumstance seems to confine the prophecy within the limits above mentioned, while the port of Elath was in their hands, which was lost under Ahaz, and never recovered." The learned bishop farther declares it to be his opinion, "That from the sixth verse to the end of the second chapter,

“ chapter, is foretold the punishment of the unbelieving Jews for their idolatrous practices, their confidence in their own strength, and distrust of God’s protection; and moreover the destruction of idolatry, *in consequence of the establishment of Messiah’s kingdom.*”

It seems to me, that these three chapters are altogether prophetical, and relate intirely to the times of the Messiah, to the war with the Romans, and the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus; and to other facts and events connected with these. The four first verses of the second chapter certainly relate to the times of the Messiah; and the remaining part of that chapter, and the whole third chapter, and the first verse of the fourth, are so connected with the beginning of the second, that it is most natural to understand them as relating to the same times; and the second verse of the fourth chapter, in which the prophet useth the words, *IN THAT DAY* so often used by him in the second and third chapters, seems decisively to prove this to be the true interpretation. Other strong reasons for this opinion will appear in the notes.

2. ——— in the latter days.] This expression, according to Dr. Lightfoot ii. 1043, 1074, is, in most places of scripture, to be understood of the last days of Jerusalem and the Jewish state. But in many places they certainly mean the days of the Messiah, *i. e.* the times subsequent to his birth. See Peirce and Sykes on Heb. i. 2. and Mede as cited by them.

Ibid. ——— shall come——] The word in the hebrew is *תָּבוֹא*, which here and in Jer. xxxi. 12. is translated by the LXX *ἔλθω*, *shall come*; and, as the image is of a mountain exalted on the top of the mountains, it is much more

more proper to say, that all nations shall *come* to it, than that they shall *flow* to it. In the old latin version, preserved by Tertullian. p. 186. 409, the word is *venient*; and in Micah iv. 1. the same hebrew word is translated *οἰκισται* by the LXX, and in Jer. li. 44. *οικισθαι*. Bishop Lowth observes, that, instead of *all the nations*, Micah hath only *peoples*, where the Syriac hath *ALL peoples*, as, saith he, probably it ought to be. He could not at the time of publishing his book inform his readers, that four, if not five, hebrew MSS. have in Micah *all peoples*. See Dr. Kennicott's bible.

5. O HOUSE of Jacob, come ye,

And let us walk in the light of JEHOVAH ! ]

In these two lines the prophet, AS IF LIVING SOON AFTER THE TIME OF CHRIST, calls on his countrymen of that time, and exhorts them to attend WITH HIM to the instructions, and discoveries, which God had graciously afforded to them by his servant the Messiah; and then in the four following verses he addresseth himself to God, describing the wretched and abandoned condition of the men of that time.

Ibid. ——— more than the east.] The word in the original is *מִמֶּנּוּ*, which may be rendered *more than the east*, or *from the east*. Bishop Lowth hath made choice of the latter sense. I prefer the former. The two last lines of this verse favour my interpretation of this and the two next chapters; for the Jews seem to have been more addicted to divination and other similar follies about the time of Christ, than at any other time. See Josephus passim.

7. And his land is filled with silver and gold;

And there is no end to his treasures.] The



Jews were a rich people before, and at the time of the conquest of them by Titus. " At this time, saith Josephus De B. J. vi. c. 5. §. 2. " the treasury-chambers were burnt, where was " an immense quantity of money, and an immense number of garments, with other precious things." Titus, after the burning of the temple, in answer to a petition of Simon and John, the two great leaders of the factions in Jerusalem, mentions the great wealth of the Jews. " We have given you leave, saith he, " to collect the tribute which you pay to God, " together with all such other gifts as are " dedicated to him. Nor have we called those " to account, who carried such donations, nor " given them any obstruction: till at length " you became richer than ourselves, even when " you were our enemies; and you have made " preparations for the war against us with our " own money." Josephus De B. J. vi. c. 6. §. 2. Many other passages to this purpose might be cited from Josephus.

Ibid. And his land is filled with horses;

Neither is there any end to his chariots.] The prophet Micah, after an illustrious prophecy concerning the birth of the Messiah at Bethlehem, hath the following remarkable threatening, which will greatly illustrate this part of Isaiah.

" And it shall come to pass in that day, saith

Jehovah;

" That I will cut off thy horses from the midst of thee;

" And I will destroy thy chariots;

" And I will cut off the cities of thy land;

" And

"And I will throw down all thy fortresses ;

"And I will cut off witchcrafts from thy hands ;

"And thou shalt have no more soothsayers ;

"And I will cut off thy idols and thy statues from the midst of thee ;

"And thou shalt no more worship the work of thy hands ;

"And I will root up thy groves in the midst of thee ;

"And I will destroy thy cities."

Micah v. 10—14.

8. And his land is filled with idols.] See also v. 18 and 20. It is commonly supposed, that the Jews, from their return from the Babylonish captivity, were free from idolatry. Many writers of great distinction have adopted this opinion. It will be sufficient to cite two or three of the most modern. Dr. Taylor, in his Scheme of scripture-divinity, (chap. xxxvii. p. 368.) asserts,

"That, after the Babylonish captivity, the

"Jews no more lapsed into idolatry, but re-

"mained steady in the acknowledgment and

"worship of the one living and true God."

Mr. Evanson, in his letter to bishop Hurd (p. 115, 116.) is very explicit on the subject.

' From the Babylonish captivity to the present

' hour, saith he, the Jews have not only shewn

"no inclination to, but constantly manifested

"the utmost abhorrence from idolatry of every

"kind." Bp. Law, in his Considerations, (p. 92.

5th edit.) expresseth his opinion in the following manner. "The last great captivity in

"Babylon, saith he, seems to have quite cured

"them (the Jews) of their favourite, predominant

"vice idolatry ; to which they had been before

so unaccountably addicted." Dr. Lardner,  
 having, in the first volume of his Jewish and  
 Heathen testimonies to the truth of the Christian  
 religion, treated largely concerning the Jewish  
 war, and the destruction of their city and  
 temple by the Romans, saith, (p. 282, 283.)  
 "If now we ask, Why has the Lord done thus  
 to this land and people, and to this house:  
 It cannot be said, Because they laid hold on  
 other gods and worshiped and served them.  
 For after the return from the Babylonish cap-  
 tivity, they were *for the most part* free from  
 idolatry, into which they had so often re-  
 lapsed before. Nor are they now guilty of  
 that sin, for which their dispersion should be  
 continued. For some while before the last  
 destruction of Jerusalem, they appear, from  
 all accounts, to have been generally very  
 zealous for the law of Moses, and the rites of  
 it, and very diligent in their attendance on  
 the temple at Jerusalem, to which they re-  
 sorted in great numbers from all parts of the  
 world, where they inhabited, at the solemn  
 festivals: and where a large part of the na-  
 tion was assembled to keep the passover,  
 when the final overthrow befel them." But  
 though these learned men, after many others,  
 have thus expressed themselves; yet there is  
 great reason for differing in opinion from them.  
 Our Saviour on three occasions (Matt. xii. 39.  
 xvi. 4. Mark viii. 38.) calls the Jews of his  
 time an adulterous generation; meaning, I  
 think, thereby to accuse them of idolatrous  
 practices. He is understood in this sense by  
 Wetstein, who in his note on Matt. xii. 39. thus  
 remarks. "Majores eorum, quoties a Deo rece-  
 dentes



to "dentes idololatriæ sese dediderunt, adulterium  
 shu "committere a prophetis dicuntur, ILLIS SI-  
 sh "MILES ESSE ILLORUM POSTEROS CHRISTUS  
 shu "AFFIRMAT." If at those times they de-  
 shu "served this character, it is not to be imagined,  
 shu "but that they were at least as corrupt at the  
 shu "time of the conquest of them by the Romans.  
 shu "Josephus may not perhaps expressly accuse  
 shu "them of idolatry in our Saviour's time, and  
 shu "afterwards to his own time; but the account  
 shu "which he gives of them makes it highly proba-  
 shu "ble that in those times they were much addicted  
 shu "to it. "Eleazar, saith he, the chief man  
 shu "among the Sicarii, was a descendant of Judas,  
 shu "who had persuaded not a few of the Jews not  
 shu "to enroll themselves when Cyrenius the censor  
 shu "was sent into Judæa. For then the Sicarii  
 shu "conspired against all who were willing to sub-  
 shu "mit to the Romans. They treated all such as  
 shu "enemies:—affirming that they were no  
 shu "better than strangers, since they surrendered  
 shu "to the Romans those privileges of their na-  
 shu "tion, which ought to be precious to all Jews.  
 shu "But all this was mere pretence, and  
 shu "given out with no other view than to cover  
 shu "their cruelty and avarice.—That was in-  
 shu "deed a time fruitful of all sorts of wickedness  
 shu "among the Jews; so that no evil whatever was  
 shu "left unpractised. It is impossible for man to  
 shu "contrive any new wickedness, which was not  
 shu "then committed. All were corrupt in their  
 shu "private and public character. They strove to  
 shu "exceed each other in impiety toward God  
 shu "(ΕΙ ΤΕ ΤΑΙΣ ΠΕΡΥ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΑΝΕΛΕΙΝ), and injustice  
 shu "toward their neighbour. The great men op-  
 shu "pressed the people, and the people strove to  
 shu "ruin

"ruin them. The former were ambitious of  
 "dominion; the latter had an insatiable thirst  
 "for violence and plunder.—John de-  
 "monstrated by his actions that these were  
 "more moderate than he was. For he not only  
 "put to death those who recommended right  
 "measures to him, but treated them as his  
 "greatest enemies among the citizens. He  
 "moreover oppressed his country with ten  
 "thousand instances of wickedness, such as  
 "a man already hardened in impiety toward  
 "God would naturally do, (ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρώπος  
 "ἀδικησάτω ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρώπος ἀδικησάτω.) For  
 "the table which he kept was supplied with  
 "unlawful meat, (ἐφ' ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος  
 "καὶ ἐφ' ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος.) and he disregarded the purifications prescribed  
 "by the laws of his country. It was not  
 "therefore wonderful, that he, who was so  
 "mad in impiety against God, (ὁ ἐν τῇ  
 "ἀνομίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀνομίᾳ) observed not any rules  
 "of gentleness and common affection toward  
 "men. Again, what wickedness did not Simon  
 "the son of Gioras commit? and how injuri-  
 "ously did he treat the bodies of those freemen,  
 "to whom he owed his power?—The men  
 "called zealots exceeded all in wickedness, and  
 "proved by their actions, that they were rightly  
 "so denominated." De Bel. Jud. lib. vii. c. 8.  
 §. 1. In another part of his history he informs  
 his readers, "That the zealots trampled un-  
 "der foot all laws divine and human, made a  
 "jest of their own sacred books, and derided  
 "the writings of the prophets." lib. iv. c. 6.  
 §. 3.

Orobio, the learned Jew, with whom Mr.  
 Limborch had a controversy, admits, that very  
 many

many Jews after the Babylonish captivity have been guilty of idolatry in imitation of the Greeks and Romans, and other nations, and appeals on the occasion to ancient Jewish histories. "Nec judæi, saith he, in secundo templo omnino ab idololatria fuerunt immunes: verum quidem est, quod non fuit publice, neque a superioribus permessa; tamen plurimi ex Judæis Gentilium, Græcorum ac Romanorum superstitiones amplexi fuerunt: adeo ut Antiochi tempore gymnasia peterent, in quibus de cultu idololatræ edocerentur: ac se præputiare conabantur, ut refert Josephus, et adhuc Pauli tempore in usu habebant. Neque in primo et secundo templo deficerent theologi, qui suis distinctionibus probarent, talem cultum non esse contra legem Dei, ut nunc etiam pontificii contendunt contra reformatos. Hac arte fallebantur incauti Judæi, qui etiam post Christi mortem idem crimen committebant, NON OMNES, SED PLURIMI, ut antiquæ nostræ enarrant historia." Philip. a Limborch De Veritat. Relig. Christianæ Amica Collat. cum Erudito Judæo. p. 101. edit. 1687. I add, that from St. Paul's admonition to the Colossians (ii. 18.) we have the greatest reason to believe, that the worship of angels, which is one species of idolatry, prevailed much among the Jews. See Peirce and Wettstein on the place, and Michaelis's Introductory lectures. Sect. cxxii—cxxv. If all these things be duly considered, it will, I think, appear to be extremely probable, that very many zealous Jews in and after the time of Christ kept in their houses idols of human shape and of different sizes, which they



they used for idolatrous and superstitious purposes; particularly for divination, and as oracles, which they consulted for direction in their affairs. See bishop Lowth's note. These later Jews did not renounce the worship of the true God; but with the worship of him they impiously joined the worship of other gods. Many of their ancestors had been guilty of the same absurd conduct. See bishop Law's Considerations. p. 92. 5th edit. "When they had slain their children to their idols, saith God in Ezekiel, xxiii. 39, then they came the same day into my sanctuary to profane it." Much more evidence might be adduced in support of the opinion, which I espouse; but I forbear, that this note may not be protracted to an immoderate length.

10. GO into the rock, and hide thyself in the dust.] I think it clear, that this verse, and the remainder of this chapter, and also the twelve first verses of the next chapter, are to be considered as the words of God himself. The beginning of the third chapter is manifestly connected with the twenty-first verse of this, and the fourth verse of the third must be the words of God, it being uttered in the first person singular in the original and in all the versions. See also iii. 12. 14. 15. As to the rocks and caverns, &c. mentioned in this, and the 19th and 21st verses, see Bp. Lowth's note on the two last of these verses, Mr. Blayney on Jer. xlix. 8. and 2 Harmer 224. It appears by Josephus, that in the war with the Romans, many Jews hid themselves in caverns. See De Vit. sect. 4. De Bello. lib. iii. c. 7. § 36. c. 8. § i. lib vi. c. 7. § 3. c. 9. § 4. lib. vii. c. 2. § 1. c. 9. § 1, 2; and see Luke xxiii. 30.   
Ibid.

Ibid. When he shall arise —] In the hebrew it is, *וְשׁוּבָה*, which is rightly rendered by the LXX, *ὅταν ἀναστῇ*, and by the Arabic, *cum exurget*.

Ibid. — the land —] So *אֶרֶץ* ought here to be rendered, and not *the earth*, as it is in the English bible, and by bishop Lowth; for the country of Judæa is certainly intended by the prophet. See Whitby on 2 Theff. ii, 3 (d) and 8.

11. *וְשׁוּבָה* ought, as Dr. Durell conjectured, to be *וְשׁוּבָה*; but the *ו* ought to remain in *וְשׁוּבָה*, as in v. 17. In both these verses the LXX have, *ΚΑΙ ταπεινωθήσεται*. Two *vaus* concurring in the eleventh verse, one was accidentally omitted. See also Vulg. Chald. and Syr.

10. — he shall have made —] *וְשׁוּבָה* should perhaps be *וְשׁוּבָה*. The LXX have *ἐποίησεν*, and the Vulgate *fecerat*.

21. In the Hebrew another verse follows the twenty-first; which in the English bible is translated, "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils: for wherein is he to be accounted of?" and by bishop Lowth,

"Trust ye no more in man, whose breath is in his nostrils;

For of what account is he to be made?"

This verse I have omitted, thinking it to be an interpolation. "It bears, saith the learned

"Dr. Owen, no affinity to the context; and,

"from the cast of it, one may venture to pro-

"nounce, that it was foisted in by the Jews in

"derogation of the man Christ Jesus. It is

"wanting in the LXX, and stands excluded by

"crotchets in the Arabic version, Jerom,

"who never suspected it's genuineness, owns

"however, that the Jews turned it from a

"prophecy, into a reproach, of our Saviour.

“(Vide in loco.) But a prophecy it could never be: it is not of that structure. It is manifestly a reproachful Jewish insertion: and Aquila knew perfectly well, how to render it according to the sense intended by it; which yet is no other than the sense we ourselves have given to it.” Critical disquisitions, p. 40. See also Bos’s note. In saying that the verse stands excluded by crotchets in the Arabic version, Dr. Owen hath expressed himself too strongly. The verse, it is true, is included in crotchets in that version in the London Polyglot; but it is so printed there, because it is added in that edition from a MS. copy of that version, and not by way of exclusion. Bishop Walton in the Prolegomena xix. 21. treating of the Arabic version, and of the MSS. from which it had been printed, saith; “Prophetarum omnium liber MS. vetustissimus, quem academix Oxoniensi inter alios libros orientales legavit Jo. Seldenus: versio præstantissima plerumque sequitur textum hebræum illumque exprimit, aliquando cum versione LXX concordat.—Quicquid deerat ex hoc exemplari supplementum et uncis inclusimus cum his literis MS. Oxon.”

## C H A P. III.

I. ——— the Lord——] Heb. יְהוָה. LXX ὁ Θεσποτης. See my second note on i. 24.

Ibid. The whole stay of bread, and the whole stay of water.] This prophecy was most remarkably fulfilled by the dreadful famine which prevailed at Jerusalem, while it was besieged by



by the Romans, and of which Josephus hath given a particular account in many parts of his history. Having related that the three factions under Simon, Eleazar and John were reduced to two, by a union formed between the second and third, he proceeds to say, " That before that union, while they were in three parties, they set fire to several store-houses, which were full of corn and other provisions; as if they had done it on purpose to serve the Romans, weakening their own strength, and destroying provisions sufficient for a siege of many years, and that hereby a famine was occasioned, which could not have happened, if they had not in this manner brought it on themselves." Lib. v. c. i. §. 4. And in a speech which he made to the Jews by order of Titus, he intreats them to save themselves, their temple and their country, and tells them, that they were fighting against God. " Moreover, saith he, those springs, which were almost dried up, when they were in your power, afford plenty of water to Titus. For you know, that before his coming, Siloam and all the other springs about the city so far failed, that water was sold by the pitcher; whereas they now produce to your enemies a quantity sufficient not only for themselves, and their cattle, but also for the gardens. The same wonderful sign (*τις*) you experienced formerly, when the king of Babylon made war against us, who took this city and burnt the temple; though the men of that time were not, I believe, so impious as you," (*αδελφοι, οἱ μὲν τῶν τότε ποσειδηκῶν τελευκῶν ἡλικὸν ὑμῖν.*) Lib. v. c. 9. §. 4. Many other passages might be cited from Josephus, in which he represents

the extreme distress to which the Jews at that time were reduced by the famine: but these are sufficient for shewing in how literal a sense this prophecy was now fulfilled. God did indeed remove from Jerusalem and from Judah, the whole stay of bread, and the whole stay of water. "What Josephus affirms, saith Dr. Jortin, concerning this fountain [Siloam] at the time when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans, and which is also taken notice of by Bishope, is extremely remarkable, and should be added to what has been said, vol. i. p. 49. concerning the wonders which happened at the destruction of Jerusalem, and which shewed that God had forsaken the Jews." Remarks on Ecclesiastical History. ii. 99. edit. 1752.

2--5. The accomplishment of the particulars in these verses may be shewn from Josephus. It is apparent from his whole history of the war, that most of the Jewish leaders were weak and wicked beyond example. He also observes concerning some of them, that they were young. "At the temple, saith he (De B. J. ii. c. 17. §. 2.) Eleazar, son of Ananias the priest, A YOUNG MAN of a daring temper, and then governor, persuaded those who officiated in the divine service not to accept the gift or sacrifice of a foreigner. This was the origin of the war with the Romans. For thus they rejected the sacrifice of Cæsar for them. And though many of the high-priests and of the principal men of the nation, earnestly intreated them not to omit the customary respect for their governors, they could not prevail." And again in the fifth

fifth book chap. i. § 2. " Eleazar, the son of  
 " Simon, saith Josephus, who had first sepa-  
 " rated the zealots from the people, and car-  
 " ried them into the temple, as offended with  
 " the bold attempts of John, who did not  
 " cease from shedding blood, but in truth not  
 " enduring to be subject to YOUNGER TY-  
 " RANTS [or, as in some copies, A YOUNGER  
 " TYRANT] than himself, went off through a  
 " desire of superiority, and thirst for domi-  
 " nion." Many instances of great oppression  
 and cruelty towards their countrymen, and in  
 particular of the destruction of men of rank  
 and distinction in the most wanton and brutal  
 manner, may be seen collected from Josephus  
 in Dr. Lardner's Jewish and Heathen Testimo-  
 nies. i. 83, 84. 92. 95. 97. 98.

9—11. Wo to them! because they have devised  
 evil against themselves;

Saying; let us destroy the just One, for he is  
 of no use to us.

Therefore the fruits of their deeds shall they  
 eat.

Wo to the sinner! evil, according to the de-  
 serving of his hands, shall be done to  
 him.]

This passage is manifestly corrupted in the  
 hebrew; which bishop Lowth hath endea-  
 voured to correct by conjecture. But he ought,  
 I think, to have attended more to the version  
 of the LXX, which is very remarkable, and seems  
 to give the true meaning of the prophet. The  
 copies of their version agree, almost to a let-  
 ter; and they are confirmed in all the material  
 parts by Justin, p. 171, 420, 421, 427, 429,  
 except that, instead of *σωσωμεν, let us bind*, he  
 insists



insists on it strongly, that the true reading of the LXX is *αγωμεν, let us destroy*; and this reading hath also the authority of Hegeſippus apud Euseb. Eccles. Hist. ii. 23, Clemens Alex. p. 713, 714, and Tertullian adv. Marcion. iii. 22. p. 497, who all, as well as Justin, lived in the second century. In Tertullian the words are, "TOLLAMUS Justum, quia inutilis est nobis;" which, it is probable, were taken by him from the old latin version made from the greek at the end of the first or beginning of the second century. (See Dr. Kennicott's Diff. Gen. sect. 77. 79.) Dr. Owen in his Inquiry into the present state of the Septuagint version, p. 22. 65, 66, approves of this reading, and thinks that the ancient Jews wilfully corrupted both the greek and the hebrew. It is remarkable, that in three places in the New Testament in which the Jews are charged with putting the Messiah to death he is characterised as the Just One. "Ye denied, saith St. Peter, the Holy and Just One, (τοῦ Ἁγίου καὶ Δίκαιου) and desired a murderer to be granted to you: and killed the prince (or leader, Ἀρχηγόν,) of life." Acts iii. 14, 15. "Which of the prophets, saith St. Stephen, have not your fathers persecuted? And they have killed those who have foretold the coming of the Just One, (τὸν Δίκαιον,) of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers." Acts vii. 52. And St. James in his epistle (v. 6.) saith, "Ye have condemned and killed the Just One, (τοῦ Δίκαιου.)" See epistolæ duæ. p. 8. edit. 1721, and p. 462. edit. 1777. And, according to St. Luke (xxiii, 18), the Jews, when they desired Pilate the Roman governor, to put our Saviour to death, made

made use of the prophet's other expression, "and cried out all at once, saying, Away with (or, DESTROY) this man, (ΑΙΠΕ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ,) and release to us Barabbas." The bishop observes, that the Vulgate and an ancient MS. read in the singular number *אכל*, *comedet*, and he adopts this reading, whereby another alteration becomes necessary. He accordingly changeth *מעלליהם*, *their deeds* into *מעלליו*, *his deeds*, for which there doth not appear to be any authority. It may be added in support of the common reading, that the expression is most properly understood as a threatening, as in Prov. i. 31. it is said of the unwise, "That they shall eat of the fruit of their own ways." The hebrew in the last of these lines is made agreeable to the version of the LXX, by a very small alteration; by reading *בגמול*, instead of *כי גמול*; and this alteration is greatly favoured by one MS. No. 245, which hath *בגמול*, with *כי* prefixed, the last letter of which word is on a rasure. A similar expression occurs in Judges ix. 16. "And have done unto him according to the deserving of his hands, *בגמול*;" which the LXX, according to the Alexandrian and Oxford MSS. and the Aldine and Complutense editions, render *κατα το αταποδεμα*, as here they render it *κατα ιερα*. See also 2 Chron. xxxii. 25. The alterations made in this verse are of great importance; and are supported by evidence, which, in my opinion, is irresistible. And being so supported, they strongly prove, that this chapter is not a prophecy of the calamities of the Babylonish captivity.

Ibid. — to them! —] Heb. *לנפשותם*, *to their soul*, i. e. to them. The LXX have *τη ψυχην αυτων*; but

but Justin in p. 429 hath οὐκ ΑΤΤΟΝ. See my notes on i. 14. liii. 10. 12.

Ibid. — he is of no use —] This is the literal meaning of the phrase **וְלֹא שֶׁמֶץ** but in many places it signifies not only *not good*, but *hurtful*, *prejudicial*, &c. See Taylor's Concord, R. 921. No. 2, 3. In like manner in the greek and latin languages *αχρης*, and *inutilis* denote not merely a person who is of no use, but one of a directly opposite character. See Dr. Clarke on Iliad ii. 269. The LXX use the word *δυσχερες*.

12. This verse in the LXX and Arabic differs much from the bishop's translation, which I follow, and which is favoured by the fourth verse. As to **וְשִׁי**, "it doth not, saith Mr. Blayney "on Lament. ii. 20, always signify *women* properly so called; as Isaiah iii. 12. xix. 16, " (I think also, saith he, xxvii. 11.) Jer. l. 37. " li. 30. Nahum iii. 13."

15. — ye crush —] LXX. *αδινειν*.

Ibid. — ye grind —] LXX. *κατασχυειν*.

16. Thus saith **יהוה**, God of hosts.] For **אֲדֹנָי** in v. 15. MS. No. 1. hath **אֱלֹהִים**, and the former word is omitted in MSS. No. 4 and 72, and, as it seems, in Vulg. and Chald. **אֲדֹנָי** means *my Lord*; and it is highly probable, that it never ought to precede **צבאות**. See bishop Lowth on vi. 1. and lx. 1. In v. 15. **יהוה** is omitted in MS. No. 180, and in v. 16. the same word is omitted in MS. No. 224. As there are these variations in the MSS. in the last line of the 15th verse, and the first line of the 16th, and as the version of the LXX is *ΤΑΔΕ λεγει ος ανος*, it is probable, that the true reading of the hebrew is, **אמר יהוה אלהי צבאות**. The particle **כֹּה**, *thus*, hath been omitted in other



other places. See my first note on i. 24. and bishop Lowth's on xlix. 5.

Ibid. ——— the daughters of Sion — ] The calamities and distresses of the women in Judæa, during the war with the Romans, were uncommonly great, as the history of Josephus in many places shews. See in particular the passages cited from him in 1 Lardner's Jewish and Heathen Testimonies. p. 102. 104; and see Luke xxiii. 28, 29. "Daughters of Jerusalem, said our Saviour to the women who attended him to his crucifixion, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children. For behold, the days are coming, in which they will say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs which never bare, and the breasts which never gave suck."

17. ——— JEHOVAH — ] Many copies and the Chaldee paraphrase have יהוה instead of ארני. The LXX have ὁ θεός; and so the Arabic.

18. ——— JEHOVAH — ] Many copies have here also יהוה instead of ארני. The LXX have κυριος; and so the Arabic.

24. And thou shalt have — ] It is probable, that the word לך, *tibi*, ought to be inserted after יהוה; for the LXX afterwards in this verse have three verbs in the second person singular, and in the next verse the hebrew hath the affix of the second person twice, which is confirmed by Vulg. Syr. and Chald. and also by the LXX, who have ὁ υἱος σου and οὗτος υἱος σου. Sion is personified in many other parts of the writings of Isaiah. See in particular xvi. 1. 3. 4. xxxvii. 22. xlix. 14.—26. li. 3.—lii. 1, 2. and lx. throughout. And in like manner Babylon is personified in xlix. i. &c. I have

therefore taken the liberty of adding in the 24th verse the words, O Sion, inclosed in hooks, in the same manner as they are added by bishop Lowth in xvi. 4. In his version of the 25th and 26th verses there is great confusion.

Ibid. These things shalt thou have instead of beauty.] The reading of the three MSS. of the LXX mentioned by bishop Lowth, ταυτα σοι εστι καλλωπισμου, makes it probable, that, instead of פי תחת כי, which are manifestly defective, we ought to read פִּי יְחַיֶּךָ תַּחַת פִּי אֱלֹהִים; or, as the LXX have not the word εστι, and as two of those three MSS. of their version add the word σοι after καλλωπισμου, the true reading may be פִּי יְחַיֶּךָ תַּחַת פִּי אֱלֹהִים; *These things shalt thou have instead of thy beauty.* The word σοι answering to תי, tibi, in this addition of the LXX is a farther proof, that the word תי ought to be inserted at the beginning of the verse. See the preceding note.

26. — thy doors—] So it certainly should be; not, as in the bishop's translation, her doors. The LXX have αι θυραι τε κοσμος ΤΜΩΝ. פתותיה should be פתותיה.

Ibid. — shall lament and mourn.] Jeremiah (xiv. 1, 2.) hath a like representation, which is well translated and explained by Mr. Blayney.  
 “Because of the drought Judah mourneth,  
 “And the gates thereof languish.  
 “They are in deep mourning for the land;  
 “And the cry of Jerusalem is gone up.  
 “The gates of cities, saith that learned critic,  
 “being places of public resort, where the courts  
 “of justice were holden, and other common  
 “business transacted, seem here to be put for  
 “the

“ the persons that meet there ; in like manner  
 “ as when we say, *the court is in mourning*, we  
 “ mean the persons that attend the court or  
 “ king’s palace. So that by this passage we  
 “ are to understand, that all persons who ap-  
 “ pear in public are dejected, and put on black,  
 “ or mourning, on account of the national dis-  
 “ tress.” In Jeremiah the word is מַעְיָן, which  
 is rightly translated *the gates thereof*. The word  
 in Isaiah means rather the doors of houses ;  
 and Mr. Harmer, in his excellent Observations  
 on divers passages of scripture, hath clearly  
 shewn, that in the east it was, and is customary  
 for the masters of families to receive visits,  
 and dispatch business, in the porches or gate-  
 ways of their houses. This modern practice he  
 hath happily applied to the illustration of  
 Ezek. xxxiii. 30. in chap. i. observ. 6.

Ibid. And desolate shalt thou sit on the ground.]  
 The LXX have here two verbs in the second  
 person, *καὶ καταλυθήσῃ μοι, καὶ εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐδαιώσῃ*.  
 For illustrating this prophetic description the  
 bishop cites Mr. Addison’s Dialogues on medals,  
 who observes, “ That we find Judæa on several  
 “ coins of Vespasian and Titus in a posture that  
 “ denotes sorrow and captivity.” But whereas  
 Mr. Addison refers to this place of Isaiah as  
 foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem and the  
 Jewish nation by the Romans, the bishop saith,  
 “ That it seems plainly to relate, in it’s first  
 “ and more immediate view at least, to the de-  
 “ struction of the city by Nebuchadnezzar,  
 “ and the dissolution of the Jewish state under  
 “ the captivity at Babylon.” I hope, that,  
 from the observations made, and to be made  
 by me, the reader will think with Mr. Addison,



that it relates solely to the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation by the Romans. This part of Isaiah may be illustrated by the fine description of the situation of Panthea, the wife of Abradatas king of the Susans, when she was taken captive by Cyrus, which is given by Araspas in Xenophon. She was, saith he to Cyrus, *καθήμενη, κεκαλυμμένη τε καὶ οὐκ ὄντισσα*. Dr. Hutchinson the editor well observes; “ En expressam summi doloris imaginem! Humi Panthea sedet, ore velato, dejectis in terram oculis. Haud aliam Judææ captæ figuram nummi Vespasiani Titique exhibent: vide (nam tanti est) Addisonum, politioris humanitatis peritissimum, in Dialog. de utilit. Numism. Ser. 3. fig. 13. et illustr. Spanhem. Dissert. quartam. His adde omnino Isai. iii. 26. Psal. cxxxvii. Lament. i. 1, 2, 10.” Xenoph. De Cyri institut. lib. v. ad init.

#### C H A P. IV.

1. — in that day —.] These words are in the Complutense edition of the LXX: but as they are omitted in the other copies, and in the Arabic, and also in one hebrew MS. No. 175, they are perhaps in this place an interpolation.
2. In that day shall the branch of JEHOVAH.] In this verse the hebrew and LXX differ greatly: but the former seems to be right.
3. — written for life in Jerusalem.] Heb. *כִּי חַיָּה*; which is rightly rendered by the LXX *ὅτι ζωὴν, for life, or, to life.* See Dr. S. Clarke's Boyle's lectures. ii. 240. 6th edit. and Dr. Taylor's Concord. R. 574. No. 105. The Chald.

Chald. Syr. Arab. and Vulg. seem to agree with the LXX. It deserves, I think, to be considered, whether by the persons here described as *written for life in Jerusalem*, be not intended the Christians mentioned Matt. xxiv. 22, 24. by the name of *the elect*, who were wonderfully preserved at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, agreeably to repeated assurances given to them by Christ, "Whosoever, saith he, shall persevere to the end, shall be saved." Matt. x. 22. xxiv. 13. Mark xiii. 13. And in St. Luke xxi. 18, 19. foretelling the destruction, which would soon befall the Jewish nation, he saith; "But there shall not a hair of your head perish. By your perseverance ye shall save your lives." In the English bible, the nineteenth verse is translated as a precept; "In your patience possess ye your souls:" But it ought certainly to be understood as a prophecy; and *κτρωσθαι* should be *κτρωσθαι*, as it is in the Alexandrian and other greek MSS, which are confirmed by the Vulgate and the old latin version, and by the Syriac and other authorities. This reading is approved by Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, and bishop Pearce. Dr. Mill in his Prolegomena, sect. 677. observes, that Origen and many others have this reading; and he adds, "Recte. Neque enim est sermo exhortatorius, quomodo representant editiones nostræ, sed assertorius. Eos scilicet quos Christus jam allocutus est, modo perseveraverint in fide, a clade Judaicæ Genti mox obventura incolumes evasuros esse seipsosque servaturos. Id quod Matthæus et Marcus breviter indicant: *ο δε υπομεινας εως τελος, υτος σωθησεται.*"

We

We have great reason to believe, that this prophecy was literally fulfilled. I will transcribe bishop Pearce's note on Matt. xxiv. 13. " Josephus De Bell. Jud. iv. 8. 2. says, that, " when Vespasian was drawing his forces towards Jerusalem to besiege it, a great multitude of those who were at Jericho withdrew themselves from thence, <sup>וְהָיוּ</sup> into the mountainous country: and in Bell. Jud. ii. 19. 6. and 20. 1. he tells us, that many fled out of Jerusalem before the siege began. " But Eusebius in his Hist. eccles. iii. 5. goes farther, and informs us, that THE CHRISTIANS OF JERUSALEM, being warned by a revelation concerning the approaching war, departed from the city and went to dwell in a town called Pella, on the other side of " Jordan." See also his note on Matt. xiii. 41. and Dr. Whitby on Matt. xxiv. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. and on Luke xxi. 18, and Dr. Lardner's Jewish and Heathen Testimonies. i. 13, 14. 75, 76. 131. In the prophet Joel (ii. 28—32.) is a remarkable prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, which is cited by St. Peter in Acts ii. 17—21; and in this prophecy the preservation of the Christians is foretold in these words, " And it shall come to pass, whosoever shall call on the name of JEHOVAH shall be saved," or, as our translators express it in Joel, " shall be delivered." See also Ps. xviii. 25—27; and Mr. Peirce's Dissertation on Rom. xv. 7—9. p. 13, 14. St. Paul in Rom. x. 13. cites this part of Joel's prophecy, " Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved;" and he is generally understood to cite it as having reference only



to eternal salvation ; but his purpose in citing it, which was to prove, that God is good to all who obey him, will be sufficiently answered, if the true meaning be, that all faithful Christians, whether converted from Judaism or Heathenism, shall be saved, by the interposition of divine Providence, from the destruction coming on Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. See Mr. Lindsey's Sequel. p. 359—363.

4. Since —] This verse is more properly connected with the foregoing according to the LXX, than it is in our version, or in that of bishop Lowth. It begins with the particle  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ , which, as I have observed in a note on liii. 10. already published, signifies *quia*, *quandoquidem*, &c; and it is in this place translated by the LXX  $\sigma\tau\iota$ , and by the Arabic *enim*. In Gen. xxiii. 13. the Samaritan reading is certainly right,  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ ; which the LXX have properly rendered,  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\alpha\upsilon$   $\pi\epsilon\sigma\varsigma$   $\epsilon\mu\iota$   $\sigma\tau\iota$ . See Bos. Proleg. ad LXX. c. i.

Ibid. —  $\text{JEROUAN}$  —] Fourteen MSS. and the two old editions of 1486, and 1488, have  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  instead of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ , and another MS. hath both words.

Ibid. — will wash away —] Heb.  $\text{וַיִּטַּח}$ ; which is rendered by bishop Lowth *shall have washed away*: but the translation which I have given is right, and it is agreeable to the LXX,  $\epsilon\kappa\pi\lambda\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , and the Arabic, *abluet*.

Ibid. — of the sons and daughters —] The LXX have  $\tau\omega\upsilon$   $\nu\iota\omicron\upsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\iota$   $\tau\omega\upsilon$   $\theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\epsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ ; rightly, as it seems. See Psal. cxlix. 2, and Joel ii. 23; where we have  $\text{בְּנֵי צִיּוֹן}$ , translated by the LXX in the former place  $\nu\iota\omicron\upsilon$   $\Sigma\iota\omicron\upsilon$ , and in the latter

and by our translators in both children of Zion.

Ibid. By a spirit of judgment, and by a spirit of burning.]

This whole verse seems to relate directly and solely to the destruction of Jerusalem. A passage of Josephus (Ant. xx. c. 7. § 5.) will greatly illustrate it. "It seems to me, saith he, that God, detesting their impiety, forsook our city; and not esteeming the temple any longer a pure habitation for him, brought the Romans against us, THREW ON THE CITY A FIRE TO PURIFY IT; AND DELIVERED US WITH OUR WIVES AND CHILDREN TO SERVITUDE, THAT BY THESE CALAMITIES WE MIGHT LEARN WISDOM." See also De Bel. Jud. iv. c. 5. § 2.

6. ————— for a shade from the heat;  
And for a covert, and a refuge, from storm and rain.]

In the hebrew it is, "for a shade BY DAY from the heat." But as the LXX have no word answering to לַיְלָה, *by day*, and as in the end of the verse there is no word in the hebrew or greek, or in any of the versions, signifying, *by night*; the word לַיְלָה seems to be inserted here by mistake. So in Isai. xxv. 4. God is described to have been "a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat;" the words *by day* and *by night* not being inserted.

## CHAP. V.

1. I WILL sing now to my beloved,  
A song of loves concerning my vineyard.]

It

It seems to me, that Bp. Lowth is right in reading דָּרִי instead of דָּרִי, (see Blayney on Jer. xi. 15.) whereby, as he observes, the great impropriety of making the author of the Song, and the person to whom it is addressed, to be the same, is avoided. But though by admitting this correction some impropriety be avoided, yet his translation of the beginning of this chapter is still liable to great objections. It is of great consequence to ascertain the person uttering the Song, or in whose name it is uttered, and also the person or persons to whom it is addressed. I think it apparent from many circumstances, that God is the person uttering it, or in whose name it is uttered; for who but God could say, "I will command the clouds, that they shed no rain on it?" And it is equally clear, that it is addressed to the house of Israel, the favoured people of God. In the bishop's translation the person uttering the song, or in whose name it is uttered, several times (viz. v. 3, 4 and 5.) calls the vineyard his vineyard agreeably to the original כַּרְמִי, *my vineyard*, and the seventh verse expressly states the house of Israel, the subject of the parable, to be the vineyard of JEHOVAH; and yet the first verse represents the vineyard as belonging to the Beloved, to whom the song is addressed, and the second verse states the Beloved *to have fenced it round; to have cleared it from the stones; to have planted it with the vine of Sorek; to have built a tower in the midst of it; to have hewed out a lake therein, and to have expected*, that it should bring forth grapes. Is it probable, that there was at first such confusion in this beautiful parable? I think not;



but that it hath been occasioned by the mistakes of transcribers. By making eight small alterations in the first and second verses, seven of which are directly authorised by the LXX, the confusion above mentioned may be intirely removed, and the whole passage restored to its original simplicity and beauty. In the first verse the LXX read *לכרמי*, concerning my vineyard, (*לכרמי* MOT,) instead of the present reading *לכרמי*, concerning his vineyard; and in the second verse they read six verbs in the first person, and not, as they are now in the hebrew, in the third; i. e. I made a fence about it, not he made a fence about it, &c. &c.; and the Arabic version in like manner hath the verbs in the first person. It is also observable, that the Chaldee paraphrast appears to have found the verbs in the first person; “*Populus meus, dilectus meus Israel, dedi eis*” “*Hæreditatem in monte excelso, in terra pingui.*” “*Et sanctificavi eos, et honorificavi eos,*” “*et sustentavi eos ut plantationem vitis electæ,*” “*et ædificavi sanctuarium meum in medio eorum;*” and that Jeremiah (ii. 21.) in an elegant paraphrase of part of Isaiah’s parable in the name of God hath one of the verbs in the first person; “*But I planted thee a Sorek &c.—*” See bishop Lowth’s Notes. In consequence of these alterations, it is necessary to read *ל* instead of the second *ל*, i. e. *mihi*; not, *dilecto meo*; and the cause of this mistake may be assigned with great probability. The prophet, it is probable, wrote,

אשרה נא לידי  
שירת רועים לכרמי  
כרם היה לי בקרו בו שמוע

A tran-

A transcriber, having these lines before him to copy, might, through an easy mistake, write in the last line לרר, a word which he had written in the line but one above, instead of ך; consisting of the two first letters of the other word: and this mistake might be made before the version of the LXX, or that version may have been conformed to it since, as, in many other instances, the versions originally right have been made conformable to corruptions afterwards introduced into the original. See Dr. Kennicott's Dissert. on 1 Sam. vi. 19. p. 37, 38. and Diss. Gen. §. 18. Bishop Lowth follows a MS, which adds the word שר after נ in the first line: but as the word is omitted in all other MSS. and in all the versions, and the sense is complete without it, I cannot concur with him in adding it.

6. And I will make it a desolation.] The LXX seem to have read כרמי, *my vineyard*, instead of the pronoun. Their version is, Καὶ αὕτως τοῖς ἀμπελώσι μν.

Ibid. — neither shall it be digged.] LXX. Οὐδὲ μν σκαφή. See 2 Harmer 432.

8. W O to you who—] It is apparent from the next verse, in which the prophet speaks of God as having made a revelation to him, that the threatenings contained in the remainder of this chapter are not uttered in the words of God but of the prophet; and consequently the words *my people* in the 13th verse mean the prophet's people. See my note on these words in liii. 8.

13. — for want of the knowledge of JEHOVAH.] The LXX have, διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶδέναι αὐτὰς ΤΟΝ ΚΥΡΙΟΝ; and the Arabic, *eo quod non noverint DOMINUM*. The word מן seems to have been lost here, as in many other places, by having been con-

tractedly written. See my note on liii. 1. It is observable, that three MSS. No. 93, 145, and 158, and perhaps a fourth No. 130, have יהוה, *i. e.* יהוה, the present reading, with the emphatic article ה, "for want of THE knowledge." If this reading be right, the word JEHOVAH must be added. The context also favours the addition.

14. Therefore Hades——] Heb. שְׁאוֹל. It means *the common receptacle of the dead*, called by the Hebrews *Sheol*, and by the Greeks *Hades*. See Farmer on Idolatry. Pref. xxix. &c.
16. The version of the LXX is ἡ κοίτη τοῦ θανάτου, and with it agrees the Arabic. See Mede's Works. p. 10.
17. ——the lambs——] The LXX have ἀρνίς; and with them agree Vulg, Syr. and Arab.
19. ——come to pass——] Heb. וְתָקַרְבַּ וְתָבוֹאָה. The LXX have translated only one of these words; καὶ ἐλθῶν. It is probable, that one of them is a marginal explanation of the other.
26. ——them——] The LXX have αὐτοίς, or, according to the Alexandrian MS, αὐτοῖς. They seem to have read לָהֶם instead of לוֹ. And so the Syriac and Arabic. The Vulgate and Chaldee agree with the present Hebrew, which cannot, I think, bear the sense given by bishop Lowth, *every one of them*.
28. And the wheels of their chariots——] The LXX have οἱ τροχοὶ τῶν ἀρμάτων αὐτῶν; rightly, as it seems. The present Hebrew hath no word for *chariots*.

## C H A P. VI.

1. I saw JEHOVAH ] Bishop Lowth, in his introduction to his notes on this chapter, asserts, "That



“ That the Lord upon the throne, according to  
 “ St. John xii. 41, was Christ.” In like manner  
 bishop Pearce in his Commentary on St. John.  
 “ In Isai. vi. 1. 5. 8. it appears, saith he, that  
 “ the glory, which the prophet saw, was that  
 “ of JEHOVAH: John therefore saying here,  
 “ that it was the glory of Jesus or of the  
 “ Christ, we may conclude from hence, that  
 “ John counted Jesus to be JEHOVAH.” How  
 absurd! Is Christ, who suffered death on the  
 cross, the king, JEHOVAH, God of hosts?  
 Did the Seraphim address themselves to him,  
 when they cried, saying,

Holy, holy, holy, JEHOVAH, God of hosts!

The whole earth is full of his glory?

It is wonderful indeed, that such learned and  
 good men should have satisfied themselves in  
 shutting their eyes against the clearest light; and  
 in thus offering to the world an interpretation  
 which they must have known to be liable to  
 great objections. How easy and natural is the  
 interpretation of John xii. 41. given by Dr.  
 Clarke in his Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity?

“ The true meaning, saith he, No. 597, is;  
 “ when Esaias (ch. vi. 1.) saw the glory of  
 “ God the Father revealing to him the coming  
 “ of Christ, he then saw the glory of him,  
 “ who was to come in the glory of his Father,  
 “ Matt. xvi. 27. Esaias, in beholding the  
 “ glory of God, and in receiving from him a  
 “ revelation of the coming of Christ, saw  
 “ (that is, foresaw) the glory of Christ; just  
 “ as Abraham, John viii. 56, saw (that is,  
 “ foresaw) his day, and was glad.” See Mr.  
 Lindsey’s Sequel to his Apology. p. 354. In  
 this work the learned and worthy author hath  
 proved,

proved, almost to a demonstration, that the name JEHOVAH is appropriated to the God and Father of all, and is in no one instance applied to Christ. See p. 295—386. See also, Mr. Farmer's invaluable dissertation on miracles, chap. iii. § 5. p. 328—359.

Ibid. And the temple was full of his glory.] The LXX had a reading in their Hebrew copy different from the present; for their version is, *καὶ πλήρης ὁ οἶκος* THE ΔΟΞΗ αὐτοῦ, which is confirmed by the Chaldee and Arabic. It is probable, that instead of שׁוֹנֵי, which in no other place signifies the train of a robe, we ought to read הִוָּר, *his glory*. "God," as bishop Lowth in his introduction to his notes on this chapter observes, "is represented as seated on his throne above the ark in the most holy place, where the glory appeared above the cherubim, surrounded by his attendant ministers." There seems therefore to be an incongruity in representing at the same time the train of his robe as filling the temple. In this verse, the word in the Hebrew is הִוָּר; but in the fourth it is הֵבֵר. I follow bishop Lowth in rendering both words, *the temple*. The LXX have in both verses ὁ οἶκος, *the house*.

5. I am struck dumb.] According to the margin of the Marchalian MS. the version of the LXX was, *οὐκ ἐλάλησα*. See Bos. Vulg. *Quia tacui*.

8. And who will go to his people?] I here follow the LXX and Arabic. As it is immediately before asked, "Whom shall I send?" Not, "Whom shall we send?" their reading is probably right. In one MS. No. 130, the two last letters in *נִלְךָ* are on a rasure. If the common be the genuine reading, it must be understood

understood to be deliberative language, in the manner explained by Dr. Taylor in his Scheme of Scripture-divinity. Chap. xxi.

9, 10. The very remarkable prophecy contained in these verses is cited in whole, or in part, in many places of the New Testament. In Matt. xiii. 14, 15. and Acts xxviii. 26, 27. it is cited at full length from the LXX; and their version being so confirmed ought, I doubt not, to be followed by us, especially as the hebrew by some small alterations may be made exactly conformable to it. For ~~ακουετε~~ we should read, in conformity with the hebrew, ~~ακουετε~~, as the Alexandrian MS. hath the word in Isaiah and in Acts, and as several other valuable MSS have it in Matthew (the Alexandrian MS being there defective,) and in Acts; and for ~~καψετε~~ we should read ~~καψετε~~ with the hebrew and the Alexandrian MS. in Acts and with several other MSS. there and in Matthew. The beginning of the tenth verse, bishop Lowth, with many others, renders in this manner,

“ Make gross the heart of this people;

“ Make their ears dull, and close up their eyes:”

But surely the other construction of the words, which is authorised by the LXX and the New Testament, and which expressly chargeth the blindness and obduracy of the Jews on themselves, ought to be preferred. This construction is farther confirmed by the Syriac and Arabic versions; and by the old latin version preserved in Tertullian, p. 399. D, which is thus; “ Incrassatum est enim cor populi hujus, et auribus graviter audierunt, et oculos con-  
cluserunt.” See Dr. Randolph on the prophe-  
cies



cies cited in the New Testament, No. 15. This learned man considers the words *הָעָם הַזֶּה*, *this people*, as the nominative case, but the word *לֵב*, *the heart*, is more properly the nominative case, as it is represented to be in the ancient versions; and in the next line the words *הָעָם הַזֶּה* must be understood to agree with *הַלֵּב* and *הַשֵּׁן*. In John xii. 40. the prophecy is not cited at length; but it is there given more fully than it is in Mark iv. 12. and Luke viii. 10. Our version in John xii. 40. is; "He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts:" but it is probable, as Dr. Randolph observes, No. 42, that the true translation is, "THEY have blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts," the nominative case to the words *τυφλωσάντες* and *καταμυσάντες* being *ὁ λαὸς τούτος*, *this people*, which words, or the relative *αὐτοὶ* instead of them, the LXX consider as the nominative case to *παρακαλῶν* and *καταμυσάντες*. The conclusion of the cited passage, "and I may heal them," is more proper if the former part be thus understood, than it is if we understand God to be the nominative case to the above mentioned words *τυφλωσάντες* and *καταμυσάντες*. It may be proper to observe farther, that for *וְאֶנִּי הַכֵּבֶד* one MS. No. 80. hath *וְכִאוֹנִי הַכֵּבֶד*, et *IN auribus suis gravis est*, viz. *hic populus*.

11. And I said: how long, ———?] This question, and the answer made to it, clearly prove, that the two former verses are rightly applied to the Jews in the time of Christ. Those verses give a description of the people, as they were in the prophet's days; and the answer to this inquiry contains a prediction, that they would continue to deserve the same character for a long time to come; namely, till the destruction

struction of Jerusalem and the dissolution of the commonwealth by the Romans. See bishop Lowth's note on the last verse of the chapter, and his Introductory note.

Ibid. O JEHOVAH? ] Many copies have *יהוה* instead of *אדני*. See Dr. Kennicott's bible; and his Diff. Gen. p. 120.

12. And there be many a deserted woman — ] This is bishop Lowth's translation; and it is probably right. The learned Mr. Hallett proposeth to translate, " And widows be multiplied —." See 1 Hallett, p. 8. and Ezek. xxii. 25.

## C H A P. VII.

2. *Ephraim* here and in verses 5, 8, and 9, as in many other places, means the ten tribes of Israel. See Jackson's Chronol. i. 309. 315. and Blayney on Jer. vii. 12.
3. Then said — ] See the first note on ver. 13.
4. Because of the two tails of these smoking fire-brands. ] " How lively," saith the very ingettious Mr. Harmer, " the image ! *The remains of two small twigs, burning with violence at one end, as appears by the strong steaming of the other ; sure therefore soon to disappear, reduced into ashes : so shall these two kings soon be no more.*" See vol. i. p. 263, 264.
7. — JEHOVAH, God of hosts. ] Three MSS. omit *אדני*; and one MS. No 129 hath *יהוה צבאות* agreeably to the LXX, whose translation is *αυτος οςαυτως*.
- 8, 9. I follow the arrangement recommended by Dr. Jubb; which seems to be clearly right. See his note in bishop Lowth's Isaiah.

G g

9. — within

9. — within sixty and five years.] Bishop Lowth adopts the interpretation given by archbishop Usher in his *Annal. V. T. ad An. 3327*, and Sir Isaac Newton in his *Chronol. p. 283*, and with them supposeth the term here mentioned to commence from the time of delivering this prophecy in the second year of Ahaz, and the prophecy to be fulfilled by the depopulation of the kingdom of Israel by Esarhaddon, “who, saith he, carried away the remains of the ten tribes, which had been left by Tiglath-Pileser, and Shalmaneser, and who planted the country with new inhabitants.” The learned Dr. Jubb, as it appears by a note, which he communicated to the bishop, concurs with him in this opinion. But Mr. Jackson in his *Chronology*, (vol. i. p. 314—316,) hath clearly proved the learned writers, on whom bishop Lowth relies, to be in an error. “This was the term, saith that most excellent chronologer, which God had appointed for the captivity of Israel, from the time that he had sent prophets to forewarn them of it. The first of these was Amos, all whose prophecies almost declare God’s judgments against the Israelites for their idolatries and immoralities, and threaten them with utter destruction. Amos began to prophecy in the latter end of the reign of Jeroboam the 2d, and two years before the earthquake, which happened in the year before Christ 783, as is most probable:—so he began to prophecy in the year before Christ 785, and Hoseah prophesied against the Israelites about the same time; and Isaiah a few years after them. Now from the year before Christ 785, when God



" God first foretold the utter destruction of the  
 " kingdom of Israel, and the captivity of the  
 " people of the land, by Amos, to the year  
 " before Christ 721, when Samaria was taken,  
 " and all the people of it, and of the cities  
 " belonging to it, were carried into captivity,  
 " and the land inhabited by other nations sent  
 " from the Assyrian provinces, is sixty-four  
 " years; and so within sixty-five years, as  
 " Isaiah foretold, Ephraim was broken from  
 " being any more a people. And this was the  
 " explication of the ancient Jews, as Jerome  
 " relates in his Commentary on the passage of  
 " Isaiah. ch. vii. 8. And by this interpretation  
 " the prophecy was exactly fulfilled; nor do I  
 " apprehend that it can be made out any other  
 " way." In Ezra iv. 2. we ought, as Mr.  
 Jackson (i. 314. 316.) remarks, to read, agreeably  
 to Josephus. *Antiq. Jud. lib. xi. c. 2. p. 549.*  
 and c. 4. p. 556. Salmanasar instead of Asar-  
 Haddon; for, as he well observes, p. 314, the  
 nations mentioned in Ezra iv. 9. were not sent  
 and placed in the cities of Samaria by Asar-  
 Haddon; but they were some of the colonies  
 sent from Media, Persia, Babylonia, Meso-  
 potamia and Syria by Salmanassar. If, however,  
 it be admitted, that Asar-Haddon had sent a  
 colony into the land of Israel forty-four years  
 after the captivity of the ten tribes, " how could  
 " this, Mr. Jackson rightly asks, p. 316, be a  
 " fulfilling of Isaiah's prophecy, which was ful-  
 " filled forty-four years before? For the Israelites  
 " were broken and no more a people, after Sal-  
 " manasar had taken Samaria and carried them  
 " away captive into Assyria. So that I wonder,  
 " that such learned men as Usher (*Annal. Vet.*

“ Test. p. 108. ad An. 677. Ant. Br. Christ.)  
 “ and the great Sir Isaac Newton (Chronology.  
 “ p. 283.) should acquiesce in an interpretation  
 “ of the prophecy, which is evidently ground-  
 “ less.” The passage of Jerome, to which Mr.  
 Jackson refers, and which he cites in the margin  
 of p. 315, is thus; “ Hebraei hunc locum ita  
 “ edisserunt; ut Amos, qui sub Ozia coepit  
 “ prophetare, quando et Isaias prophetiae suae  
 “ habuit exordium, primus prophetaverit con-  
 “ tra Israel, dicens (cap. vii. ver. 17.) *Israel*  
 “ *autem captivus ducetur de terra sua.* Titulus  
 “ quoque prophetiae ejus contra Samariam sit,  
 “ et prophetare coeperit in diebus Oziae regis  
 “ Judah ante duos annos terrae-motus:—  
 “ volunt autem annum fuisse vigesimum quin-  
 “ tum Oziae, quando haec acciderunt, cujus  
 “ reliqui anni sunt viginti septem. Ozias enim  
 “ regnavit annos quinquaginta duos: post eum  
 “ regnavit Joatham filius ejus annis sedecim;  
 “ et hujus Filius Ahaz annis aliis sedecim;  
 “ post quem regnavit Ezechias, cujus sexto  
 “ imperii anno capta Samaria est: atque ita  
 “ effici simul annos sexaginta quinque. Com.  
 “ in cap. vii. Isai. p. 68.” Mr. Jackson adds,  
 “ That Clarius is of the same opinion, ap.  
 “ Crit. Sac. tom. iv. Annot. in Loc. Isaiæ, and  
 “ Forerius from Vatablus, ibid.”

Ibid. Ephraim shall be broken from being a peo-  
 ple.] Heb. *עַם*. *lxx* *αὐτὸν αὐτὸν*; which words  
 ought to be rendered, as they are in the English  
 bible of 1599, *from being a people*, and not, as  
 they are by bishop Lowth, *that he be no more*  
*a people*. For though the ten tribes of Israel  
 were broken from being a people, and they have  
 continued in that condition two thousand and  
 five

five hundred years, yet the prophets and St. Paul give the strongest and most explicit assurances of their restoration, and of their reunion with the two other tribes. See Isai. xi. 11—16. Ezek. xxxvii. and Jer. iii. 18. and Mr. Blayney on this last place; and see Rom. xi. 25—27. and Dr. Whitby thereon, and his appendix to his notes on that chapter.

13—16. Dr. Kennicott in 1765 published a Sermon on these verses, with very valuable notes subjoined; which sermon and notes throw great light on this famous passage, though I think that his interpretation cannot be supported in every particular. I forbear to enter into a full discussion of the subject, which hath engaged the attention of many learned men. I have given the translation which appears to me to be most exact; and will endeavour to support it by short notes. Dr. Kennicott hath also made judicious observations on Psalms xlviii. and lxxxix. which seem to be of great importance on this subject; in the light in which he hath placed them.

13. Then he said.] So *אָמַר* ought here to be rendered. See Dr. Kennicott's Sermon, note (23). The *ו* is rendered *then* here and in the third verse in Coverdale's bible printed in 1550, and in the bible of 1599.

Ibid. — with you —.] This is a more proper translation of *אִתְּךָ* than that in the English bible, which is followed by bishop Lowth, *for you*. See Dr. Kennicott's note (24).

Ibid. JEHOVAH.] All the copies of the LXX have *κυριος*, and the Arabic hath *domino*; and one valuable hebrew MS. No. 93 hath *יהוה*. This is probably the true reading; for the words here,  
and



and to the end of the chapter, are more properly considered as the words of God, than of the prophet. According to the tenth verse JEHOVAH spake to Ahaz, and Ahaz, as in the twelfth verse, refusing to ask a sign from God, the thirteenth verse begins with the words, *Then he said*. The meaning of which must be, that JEHOVAH, who had before spoken to Ahaz, proceeded to speak again in his own words, uttered however by the prophet. See Dr. Kennicott's State of the hebrew text. i. 503. ii. 329.

14. Nevertheless——] The version of the LXX is *διὰ τούτου*; and bishop Lowth retains the former translation of *לכן*, *therefore*: but it certainly may be translated, as it is by Dr. Kennicott, *nevertheless*. See his Sermon, p. 26 and note (25), and Blayney on Jer. xvi. 14. and xlviii. 12.

Ibid. — the virgin —] It hath been matter of great debate, whether the word *עלמה* be rightly understood to signify *a virgin*. But as it is certain, that the authors of the greek version of Isaiah, called the version of the LXX, who were Jews, and who made their version about one hundred and thirty years before the birth of Christ, rendered the word found by them in the hebrew *ἡ παρθένος*, *the virgin*, and as St. Matthew cites the version given by them, we may, I think, be satisfied, that the word *עלמה* properly signifies *a virgin*, or that, when they made their version, the word in the original was *הבתולה* and not *העלמה*. It is undoubted, that the former word is used much oftener in that sense, than the latter; and *בתולה* is the word found in the Syriac version of Matthew i. 23.

The

The learned Dr. Jubb, in a note communicated by him to bishop Lowth, understands a particular virgin, living in the time of Isaiah, to be intended : and the bishop admits the truth of the observation, and affirms the obvious and literal meaning of the prophecy to be this ;

“ That within the time that a young woman, now a virgin, should conceive and bring forth a child, and that child should arrive at such an age as to distinguish between good and evil, that is, within a few years, (compare chap. viii. 4.) the enemies of Judah should be destroyed.” And yet in the conclusion of the note the learned bishop contends, “ That St. Matthew in applying this prophecy to the birth of Christ does it not merely in the way of accommodating the words of the prophet to a suitable case not in the prophet’s view ; *but takes it in it’s strictest, clearest and most important sense, and applies it according to the original design and principal intention of the prophet.*” How inconsistent are these assertions ! If the prophet intended a young woman, who was living in his own time, and who, though then a virgin, would not be such at the birth of her expected son ; Is it possible to be true, that St. Matthew in applying the prophecy to the birth of Christ, an event which happened not till many hundred years afterwards, applies it according to the original design and principal intention of the prophet ? Or, is it possible, on this plan, to vindicate the apostle in making the application ? In this view of things the passage cited by him is not of the least use ; it serves neither for proof, nor for illustration. The best method

method of removing all difficulties is, I think, the following. The prophet is to be understood as foretelling, in the first place, by the immediate direction, and indeed in the words, of God himself, that though an alarming conspiracy had been formed against the family of David, which at that time could not be numerous, Athaliah having attempted about one hundred and forty years before to extirpate the the family, and having nearly succeeded in the attempt, (2 Kings xi. 1. 2 Chron. xxii. 10, and Joseph. Antiq. lib. ix. c. 7. §. 1.) yet that the deliverer, who had been promised to arise from that family, would most assuredly in due time be born in a miraculous manner from a virgin descended from David. Thus far the prophecy is intended and calculated to satisfy all present, that the royal family of David would be preserved from extirpation, and that the promises formerly made, concerning blessings to be bestowed by means of an illustrious person to be born from it, would be accomplished. Many ages indeed would elapse before his birth: but the prophet on this, as on many other occasions, by the direction of God, "who, as St. Paul (Rom. iv. 17.) well observes, calleth those things which are not as if they were," represents the event as having actually taken place; and availing himself of this mode of representation, he proceeds to administer immediate consolation to the whole nation, assuring them by divine authority, and in words uttered by him in the name of God, that they would soon be delivered from the dangers which threatened them, and that if the child, ACCORDING TO THE REPRESENTA-

TION,



tion, were now actually born, he would not attain to years of discretion before the accomplishment of their deliverance, and the restoration of peace and plenty to their country. See a valuable note to this purpose, derived in part from Vitringa, in the *Adnotationes* at the end of Jackson's Novatian. p. 333—335. As the *future* birth of IMMANUEL is foretold by the prophet, though it be described by him, in his usual manner, as then taking place, it is, as Mr. Jackson well observes, no objection to this interpretation, that the LXX have translated in the future tense the verbs, which in the hebrew are in the present. And for the same reason St. Matthew hath, with great propriety, cited them as given by the LXX. It is farther to be observed, that though it pleased God to give these favourable assurances to the house of David and the kingdom of Judah, yet he immediately adds, that in no long time they would again be greatly distressed, and that a great part of their distresses would proceed from the Assyrians, to whom they had had recourse for assistance. See verses 17—25. viii. 8. &c. and 1 Jackson 309, &c.

ibid. — is with child —] The word חרה is a participle of the present tense, and signifies *is with child*, and not barely *is conceiving*; and it is so understood by the LXX here and in Gen. xxxviii. 24. See Jackson's note above cited. The meaning of the prophet is; "The virgin is with child, and is even now bringing forth a son." The English translation of Matt. i. 23. is; "Behold, a virgin *shall be with child*;" not "*shall conceive*."

H h

Ibid.

**Ibid.** And thou shalt call——] So the word *קָרָא* properly signifies, it being the second person singular of the præterit, and being made a future by the conversive *vau*; and accordingly all the remaining copies of the LXX have *καλεσεις*. Eusebius in his Commentary insists on it strongly, that *καλεσεις* is the true reading not only of the LXX and the three other greek translators, and of the hebrew, but also of St. Matthew. See Jackson's note above cited, and his note (3) in p. 86. Dr. Kennicott saith, that the hebrew word cannot be the second person singular, because the address proceeds in the plural number. But in this argument there is certainly no weight; for this word may be the second person singular, with as much propriety as it is said in the sixteenth verse, "which THOU fearest," and in the seventeenth verse, "But JEHOVAH will bring on THEE, and on THY people, and on THY father's house." The child being represented as then born, it was not improper to say, that Ahaz should call his name IMMANUEL.

**Ibid.** —— his name IMMANUEL.] "God was with us in Christ, by his wisdom and power communicated to him for the instruction and benefit of men." See Mr. Lindsey's Sequel. p. 184, &c.

15. When he shall know ——] Dr. Jubb, and Mr. Harmer (i. 299.) cited by him, have, I think, fully proved, that the word *יָדַע* ought here to be translated, *WHEN he shall know*, and not, as it is in our common translation, *THAT he may know*, nor, as Dr. Kennicott contends, *TILL he shall know*. Sermon. p. 27. and note (31.)

16. ——before

16. — before the child —] Dr. Kennicott strenuously contends, that by the child here mentioned is not intended the child before represented as born from the virgin, but Shearjashub a child of the prophet, then actually present; but as nothing is said which necessarily leads us to understand Shearjashub to be intended, it is surely more natural to understand the child mentioned in the fourteenth and sixteenth verses to be the same. Dr. Kennicott observes, “ that some end was undoubtedly to “ be answered by the presence of Isaiah’s son; “ whom God commanded the prophet to take “ with him on this visit to Ahaz: and that “ yet no use at all appears to have been made “ of this son, unless he be referred to in this “ sentence.” Sermon. p. 29. 32, 33. But if, as Dr. Kennicott on good grounds supposeth, consolation had been lately afforded to the people by the prophetic name of this child, he was with the utmost propriety brought forth on this occasion, though he might not now be made the subject of a second prophecy.

Ibid. — which thou fearest.] The hebrew is אשר אתה קץ, which words are variously rendered by different interpreters. The English version, which is retained by Dr. Kennicott, p. 32. 65. and note (40) is, “ that thou abhorrest.” Bishop Lowth’s is, “ by whose two kings thou art distressed.” I follow the version of the LXX, ὅτι σὺ φοβῶ, which appears to me to be most probable. The Arabic agrees with the LXX; and the Vulg. and Syr. have, *quam tu detestaris*.

Ibid. — of both the kings.] All the copies of the LXX, except the Alexandrian, have τῶν



Ἰουα Θεοτατης. The Alexandrian MS, instead of these words, hath only αὐτῶν. The other three greek translations add to those words the word αὐτῆς, and agree with the present hebrew שני מלכי, *both HER kings*: but one MS. No. 523. hath, agreeably to the LXX, שני מלכים, *both the kings*, and two others No. 361 and 540 had the same reading at first. The Arabic concurs with the LXX.

17. But JEHOVAH will bring——] Houbigant and the bishop rightly read יבִּיחַ from the LXX, ἄλλα σταλῶ ὁ Θεός; to mark the transition to a new subject. Though the LXX have here ὁ Θεός, yet I prefer the reading of the hebrew JEHOVAH, in which all the copies agree. See my note on v. 13. The Arabic agrees with the LXX.

#### C H A P. VIII.

4. See an account of the fulfilment of this prophecy in Jackson's Chronol. i. 310—314.
6. Because this people hath rejected  
The waters of Siloah———] Mr. Peirce in his notes on Heb. ii. 13. hath well illustrated great part of this chapter, and I adopt many of the corrections and observations of that excellent critic. By *this people* in this verse he understands the people of Israel, and by *the waters of Siloah* the people of Judah.
7. ——— JEHOVAH ———] MS. No. 1. and several others have יהוה instead of אֲדֹנָי, and, as it seems, rightly, God himself being the speaker.

8. —the

8. — the extent of his camp — ] As the LXX here use the word ~~κατασκήνω~~ it is probable, that we ought to read ~~מחנה~~ or ~~מחנה~~, (Castra ejus,) instead of ~~מחנה~~. This alteration makes very little difference in the sense; but the expression is more proper. The word ~~קנא~~ in no other place signifies the wing of an army; and no reference is here had, as it seems, to the preceding chapter, in which mention is made of *the bee, which is in the land of Assyria.*

9. Associate yourselves — ] Bishop Lowth saith, that the present reading ~~ו~~ is subject to many difficulties; and therefore he follows the reading of the LXX, ~~ו~~. But it is a great objection to this alteration, that it makes it necessary to understand the word ~~ו~~, which occurs three times in this verse, in two different senses. The common reading, as it is understood by Mr. Peirce, gives a very good and consistent sense; and it is confirmed by the Vulgate and Chaldee, which have, *congregamini.* “Associate yourselves, O ye peoples [of Israel and Syria,] and ye shall be broken; and give ear, all ye of far countries, [ye Assyrians, and such as join yourselves for their assistance,] gird yourselves, and ye shall be broken; gird yourselves and ye shall be broken. [Though God will suffer you to go far, yet not utterly to overthrow Judah; but when ye shall attempt Jerusalem, the capital city thereof, he will miserably destroy you. See chap. xxxvii. 35.]” The bishop observes, that ~~ו~~, *know ye this*, is parallel and synonymous to ~~ו~~, *give ear to it*, in the next line. But this parallelism is not necessary; and besides, the words *this* and *to it* are inserted by him

him without authority from the hebrew or greek. See his note on ix. 8.

10. For IMMANUEL . . . . . ] As IMMANUEL is a proper name, chap. vii. 14. and viii. 8. it ought probably to be considered as such in this place, and in several MSS it is written here, as in the other places, as one word. Coverdale's version in 1550 considers it as a proper name in this verse. It must necessarily be a proper name, if the 9th and 10th verses be, as they seem to be, the words of God, as well as the three preceding verses. It seems clear, that some words are here omitted.

11—13. Mr. Peirce appears to be right in considering these verses as a parenthesis, and as an instruction which God had given to the prophet at some other time. A part of them is cited by St. Peter in his first epistle, iii. 14, 15. See Mede's Works. p. 9. They are perhaps improperly inserted in this place. The whole prophecy in this chapter, from the sixth to the tenth verse, and from the fourteenth to the twenty-second verse, seems to be the words of God to Isaiah: for in the fifth verse the prophet saith, "And JEHOVAH spake yet again to me saying;" and I see no proper conclusion of the words of God before the end of the twenty-second verse, the words of IMMANUEL in the 16th, 17th, and 18th verses being included in the prophecy uttered in the name and words of God. The twenty-third verse of this chapter, and the six first verses of the ninth, must be the words of the prophet, speaking AS IF LIVING AT AND AFTER THE BIRTH



OF THE MESSIAH. To us, saith he, a child is born; to us a Son is given."

14. And he shall be to the nations for sanctification.] The 11th, 12th, and 13th verses being included in a parenthesis, Mr. Peirce connects this verse with the tenth, by the *be* understanding IMMANUEL. The word למקדש, which is rendered by the LXX as *αγιασμα*, or *αγιασμος*, and by the Vulgate in *sanctificationem*, is improperly translated in the English bible for a *sanctuary*, and by bishop Lowth, a *sanctuary*; for neither God nor Christ is a sanctuary to the church, but by the presence of God the church becomes a sanctuary to him. See Dr. Taylor's Key, No. 47. 128. The words *ויהי למקדש* and *και εσται εις αγιασμα* ought, I think, to be translated agreeably to the Vulgate, "And he [IMMANUEL] shall be for sanctification;" as St. Paul in 1 Cor. i. 30. saith of Christ, "That he is become to us wisdom from God, and justification, and SANCTIFICATION, (*αγιασμος*.) and redemption. See Dr. Taylor's Key, No. 124. Acts xxvi. 18. 2 Thess. ii. 13. The Hebrew text doth not inform us to whom IMMANUEL would be for sanctification; but the version of the LXX, as we now have it, supplies the word *σοι*, to thee, i. e. in hebrew *לך*; the Vulgate hath, *vobis*, to you, i. e. in hebrew *לכם*; and one ancient hebrew MS. No. 4. hath *להם*, to them. These different readings shew plainly, that some word, notifying the person or persons, is lost in this place; but it seems to me, that we cannot adopt any one of them as the true reading. The first of them *לך*, to thee, cannot be right, as no single person is mentioned in the context

to whom it can be applied: the second of them  
 לָכֵן, *to you*, which bishop Lowth adopts, can  
 be applied only to the children of Israel; but  
 as IMMANUEL is immediately afterwards repre-  
 sented to be a *stone of stumbling, and a rock of*  
*offence to the two houses of Israel*, (or, as Mr.  
 Peirce more properly renders the words, *to two*  
*of the houses of Israel*;) a *trap and a snare to*  
*the inhabitants of Jerusalem*, "it is, as the same  
 " judicious critic observes, natural to suppose,  
 " that they must be different persons to whom  
 " it is declared, that he should be a sanctuary,  
 " [rather, *for sanctification*.] And this, saith  
 " he, admirably suits the history of our Sa-  
 " viour, who, while the generality of the Jews  
 " were offended at him, and rejected him, be-  
 " came a sanctuary [rather, *for sanctification*]  
 " to the believing gentiles, and a small rem-  
 " nant of the Jews." It remains to be con-  
 sidered, whether the reading of the MS. above  
 mentioned לָכֵן, *to them*, be right. If this be  
 the true reading, the nations seem to be intended  
 by it; but if the 11th, 12th, and 13th verses  
 be rightly included in a parenthesis, or be  
 misplaced, the nations are not mentioned in the  
 context in such a manner, as that the word can  
 be referred to them. I therefore think it high-  
 ly probable, that the word לָכֵן, *to the nations*,  
 which is not very unlike to the words לָכֵן, *to*  
*them*, and לָכֵן, *to you*, is the true reading; and  
 I have adopted it. This correction is much con-  
 firmed by St. Peter, who, manifestly alluding  
 to this part of Isaiah, contrasts, in like manner,  
 the advantages of the believers from the na-  
 tions with the disadvantages of the unbelieving  
 Jews. " To you, saith he in 1 Pet. ii. 7-10,  
 " who

" who believe, [*i. e.* to you, believers from  
 " the nations,] he [Christ] is an honour : but  
 " to them who are disobedient [*i. e.* to the  
 " unbelieving Jews] the stone which the  
 " builders disallowed is become the head of  
 " the corner, and a stone of stumbling, and a  
 " rock of offence. They stumble at the word  
 " being disobedient, whereunto also they were  
 " appointed : [*i. e.* they are fallen from their  
 " privileges and honours, as God appointed  
 " they should in case of their unbelief:] but  
 " ye are a chosen generation, a royal priest-  
 " hood, A HOLY NATION, a peculiar people;  
 " that ye may shew forth the praises of him who  
 " hath called you out of darkness into his  
 " marvellous light : who heretofore were not a  
 " people, but now are the people of God ;  
 " who had not obtained mercy, but now have  
 " obtained mercy." See Dr. Taylor's Key,  
 No. 86, where this learned writer hath materially  
 corrected the English version of this passage.  
 An argument in confirmation of the proposed  
 correction may, in like manner, be drawn from  
 1 Cor. i. 30. above cited. " He [Christ] is  
 " become to us, saith St. Paul, wisdom from  
 " God, and justification, and SANCTIFICATION,  
 " and redemption." The apostle, it is proba-  
 ble, alludes, as St. Peter doth, to this part of  
 Isaiah, and means, that Christ is become these  
 things to us believers from the nations, con-  
 sidering himself on this, as on many other oc-  
 casions, as belonging to their body, he being  
 in a peculiar manner the apostle of the nations.  
 See Dr. Taylor's Key, No. 93, and his note  
 on Rom. v. 1.



16. The LXX have the words, *Kai esti, And he will say*, at the beginning of the next verse; but Mr. Peirce thinks, that they ought to be at the beginning of this verse, and, if the present reading of this verse in the Hebrew, which differs greatly from the LXX, be genuine, his opinion seems to be right. Mr. Peirce considers these words as inserted by the LXX of their own authority; but the proper inference is, that they were originally in the Hebrew, and have been since omitted, either by accident or design. They are confirmed by the Arabic version and the Chaldee paraphrase, which latter reads, *Dixit propheta*. It is very remarkable, that in Coverdale's version printed in 1550 the words, SAYDE THE LORD, are inserted in the 16th verse. "Now laie the witnessses together, (sayde the Lord,) and seale the lawe with my disciples." By *the Lord* here must be understood IMMANUEL, who immediately proceeds in that version to say, "Thus I waite upon the Lord" [*i. e.* JEHOVAH] that hath turned his face "from the house of Jacob, and I loke unto him. But lo as for me and the children which the Lord hath geven me, we are a token and a wondre in Israel." For בלמרי the LXX in most copies have *τα μὴ μὴδεν*; but in the Alexandrian MS *μὴ* is omitted. It is impossible, I think, to make sense of their version, either with or without the negative particle. Aquila, Symmachus and the Vulgate seem to have had this verse as we now have it. See Bos. The word בלמרי is written בלמרי in more than twenty MSS, and in the editions of 1486 and 1488, and בלמרי in one MS. No. 182. These modes of writing the word make strongly against

against the conjecture of bishop Chandler mentioned in bishop Lowth's note.

18. Whom God———] The LXX and St. Paul in Heb. ii. 13. have  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ , and the Arabic concurs with them; and this reading is remarkably confirmed by the two oldest and best Hebrew MSS, No. 1. and 590, examined by and for Dr. Kennicott, and also by one other MS, No. 93, of considerable antiquity in his collection. These MSS. have  $\text{אלהים}$  instead of  $\text{יהוה}$ . It is material to the true explication of this part of the prophecy to ascertain the point at which the words of IMMANUEL end. Mr. Peirce considers this whole verse as spoken by him. But as the LXX begin a new sentence after the words, "Behold, I and the children whom God hath given to me," and St. Paul in Heb. ii. 13. cites these words only, and it is very improbable, that he would break off in the middle of a sentence, it seems to me, that the words of IMMANUEL end with them, and that in the words immediately following the prophet proceeds in his own person to foretell the miracles to be performed for the establishment of the gospel. All the copies of the LXX, which are confirmed by the Arabic, have  $\text{καὶ ἐσὶς σῶμα}$ , and not  $\text{εἰς σῶμα}$ , except the Alexandrian MS; and if their version originally had not the præposition  $\text{ἐν}$  they must have read the Hebrew words, which they translate  $\text{σῶμα}$  and  $\text{τίματα}$  without the preposition  $\text{ב}$  prefixed. It seems, for the reasons above assigned, to be certain, that  $\text{אלהים}$  is the true reading instead of  $\text{יהוה}$ ; and it is probable, that this word  $\text{יהוה}$  might be corrupted from  $\text{יהו}$  translated by the LXX  $\text{καὶ ἐσὶς}$  after the loss of the word  $\text{אלהים}$  from the

text. As to the words מוֹרָא and מוֹרָא, and the correspondent greek words *οἰκτιρα* and *μετα*, see Mr. Peirce on Heb. ii. 4.

19. —concerning the living—] Heb. בְּעֵד הַחַיִּים, which bishop Lowth renders, "instead of the living:" but the translation of the LXX. is ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΖΩΟΝΤΩΝ, which is, I think, right. See Mr. Farmer on miracles, p. 268.

20. To the law and to the testimony, let them seek.] There is no word in the original answering to these last words, *let them seek*. They are added by bishop Lowth; and the sense seems to require them. The words *law* and *testimony* here, and in the 16th verse seem to be synonymous, and to signify the Mosaick law. See Mr. Peirce on that verse in his note on Heb. ii. 13. and see Jer. xlv. 23.

23. BUT there is no darkness in the land which was distressed.] Bishop Lowth's translation is, "But there shall not hereafter be darkness in the land which was distressed." The hebrew is here very obscure, and will as well bear the translation given by me, which is more suitable to the remainder of the verse, and to the first verses of the next chapter. Mede connects this line with the foregoing prophecy, and renders it "*Quoniam non est obscuratio ei qui angustiae est ipsi* : id est, saith he, in calamitoso et afflicto rerum statu, in quem respublica Israelitica tunc temporis, juxta legis comminationem, incidisse memoratur, atque oculis quasi subjicitur, ad indignationem et desperationem homines adactos, quod hostem quo premebantur viderint perpetuis successibus uti, neque ullum ei infortunium obvenire." See his works, p. 101, 456, 457. I doubt whether he be right  
in



in respect to this line: but he hath there made some excellent observations on the other parts of the verse.

Ibid. In the former time——] Heb. כַּעַת. This word in MS. No. 428 is on a rasure; and two MSS. No. 245 and 392 have כַּעַת, and another No. 93 had the same word at first. This reading seems to be right. Bishop Lowth follows it: but he hath not mentioned, that it is authorised by MSS. I have already observed in the note on viii. 11—13, that this verse and the six first verses of the next chapter are the words of the prophet.

Ibid. ——he hath made them glorious.] It is probable, that הַכְּבִיד should be הַכְּבִידִם with the plural affix. “ Litera ם,” saith Dr. Kennicott, Diff. Gen. sect. 26, “ nunc in nonnullis vocibus “ perperam est inserta, in nonnullis vero perperam omissa.” See bishop Lowth on Isaiah v. i. li. 4.

Ibid. ——along the Jordan] So the words עַבְרַת הַיַּרְדֵּן ought here to be translated, and not, as they are by bishop Lowth and others, *beyond* Jordan. See Hyde de Relig. Vet. Perf. p. 47, 48. edit. 1760; bishop Pearce on Matt. iv. 15, and bishop Lowth on Isaiah xviii. 1.

Ibid. ——Galilee of the nations.] This expression is well explained by the learned Mr. Bryant in his Observations on ancient history, p. 208—210. “ It [Galilee] was, he observes, more mixed “ with foreigners and aliens, than the other “ parts of the Jewish territories; which mixture of nations in Galilee was in consequence “ of the captivity of the ten tribes, and the “ captivity of Judah afterwards.” He cites a similar expression from 1 Maccab. v. 15. *πασης Γαλιλαίας ἀλλοφύλων*, *all Galilee of the Gentiles.*

CHAP.

## CHAP. IX.

1. ———which walked——] St. Matthew (iv. 16.) useth the word καθήμενος, *which sat*, which is the reading of the Alexandrian MS. here, and of the Complutense edition of the LXX, and also of Origen c. Cels. p. 278, and Eusebius in his Dem. Evang. lib. vii. p. 336. The other copies of the LXX have πορευόμενος, which is a more exact translation of the present hebrew, and they are confirmed by the Syriac, Chaldee and Vulgate. But this is of little consequence, the sense of both words being in this case the same.

Ibid. Have seen——] Origen, in the place to which I have referred in the last note, and the Complutense edition of the LXX have ἴδον agreeably to the Hebrew and St. Matthew. The other copies of the LXX have absurdly ἴδεν, or ἴδον, or ἴδον.

Ibid. They who dwelled in the land and shadow of death,

To them hath the light shined.]

Origen and Eusebius in the same places cite from Isaiah this part of the verse exactly almost as it is cited by St. Matthew, and the former cites the same again in p. 413 of the same work, with little variation; but all the MSS. and editions of the LXX have the verb very improperly in the future tense, φανήσεται ἡ λύπη σου, and many of them have ἡ λύπη σου ἔσται without καί, which word however is in the Aldine and Complutense editions of the LXX, and also in the Arabic version. It is probable, that the ought to be inserted in the hebrew. It appears also from

from the old latin version preserved in Tertul-  
lian p. 317, which is, *lumen ortum est super vos*;  
and from the Vulgate, which is, *lux orta est eis*;  
that *αυγενη* cannot be the true reading of the  
LXX.

2. ——— thou hast increased their joy.] The  
Masoretical correction of *נב* into *יב* is not only  
confirmed by the hebrew MSS mentioned by  
bishop Lowth, but also by the Syriac and the  
Chaldee paraphrase. See Dr. Kennicott's Diff.  
Gen. p. 83. n.

5. And his name shall be called] That is, he shall  
be. See Mede's works. p. 465, and bishop  
Pearce on Luke i. 35.

Ibid. ——— The Messenger of the great design;  
The Father of the Age; The Prince of Peace.]  
This part of the verse hath engaged the attention  
of many learned men; but bishop Lowth gives  
no observations on it. The original translation  
of the LXX seems to have been thus; *Μεγαλης*  
*βουλῆς ἀγγελος; πατρὸς τοῦ μελλοῦτος αἰῶνος; ἀρχῶν εἰρήνης.*  
The second and third titles are agreeable to the  
present hebrew, and are confirmed by the Vul-  
gate and many other authorities. And though  
the first title be omitted in the Vulgate, yet it  
is found in Tertullian *de Carne Christi* c. 14.  
p. 370. "Dictus est quidem, saith he, *magni*  
*consilii angelus*, id est, NUNTIVS: officii non  
"naturæ vocabulo. Magnum enim cogitatum  
"patris super hominis restitutione annuncia-  
"turis seculo erat." It is also found five times  
in Novatian *De regula fidei*. c. 18. twice; 21;  
28 & 31. Mr. Jackson, who published the  
works of Novatian, observes in his Preface,  
p. xx, that he made use of a correct Latin  
bible, and that in general he carefully followed  
it.



it. "*Verba magni consilii angelus*," saith Mr. Jackson in his note on c. 28, and to the same purpose in his note on c. 18, "omittunt Heb. Syr. Chald. Par; sed retinent cum LXX, Vers. Arab. et OMNES Græci et Latini scriptores." It is probable, that the reading of the copy, from which the LXX translated, was thus, מלאך עצה גדולה, which is not very different from the present reading, פלא יועץ אל גבור, many of the letters being the same, and others similar to the correspondent letters. The first letter in the supposed reading מ is not very unlike the first letter of the present reading פ; but anciently these letters more nearly resembled one the other. See Dr. Kennicott on the state of the Hebrew text. i. 137. ii. 213. A remarkable example of a word corrupted by the change of מ to פ occurs in Isaiah lxx. 4, where the word ופרק ought certainly to be ופרק, as it is in some of the best MSS, and in the first edition of the Hebrew bible in 1488, and in the Complutense Polyglot in 1517. See Spencer de Leg. Heb. i. 338. And as remarkable an example of a word corrupted by the change of פ to מ occurs in Isaiah xxxvii. 27. where the word שדמה ought certainly to be שדפה, as it is in four MSS, and in the other copy of this answer of God to Hezekiah in 2 Kings xix. 26. See bishop Lowth's note, and 2 Hallett. p. 94. The present copies of the LXX manifestly contain a double version of all or some of these titles of the Messiah. See Cappel. Crit. Sac. 246, 247; Kennicott on the state of the Hebrew text. ii. 403; Sykes on Heb. ii. 5, and the note in the edition of the LXX by Bos. It ought not however to be concealed, that Dr. Owen, in his Inquiry into the

LXX version, p. 48—51, considers the present reading of the hebrew as right, and supposeth the LXX not to have translated the first part of the character of the Messiah, *μεγαλης βουλης αγγελος*, but *θαυμαστος συμβουλος*, *Θεος ισχυρος*. This learned writer hath accused the Jews of wilfully corrupting the prophecies in the Old Testament relating to Christ; and he hath, in my opinion, unanswerably proved the charge in several instances: But in this and some other instances, he seems not to have had equal success. “The Jews, saith he, expunged the original translation very early out of some copies, and substituted in it's place what we now read in the Vatican, with a view to extort out of the hands of Christians, one of the principal arguments for the divinity of Christ. For what but this could hinder their own interpreters, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, from rendering the word *בן* by *Θεος*, or some equivalent expression; which yet they carefully avoided?” These are positive assertions; but they are not supported by any proof. Let us accuse and convict the Jews, when we have sufficient evidence against them; but let us not make such heavy charges on fanciful conjectures only. The proper inference, I think, from the versions of the three interpreters here mentioned, from the omission of the word *Θεος* in the Alexandrian MS, though it contain not only the words *μεγαλης βουλης αγγελος*, but also the words *θαυμαστος, συμβουλος, ισχυρος, εξουσιας, αρχων ειηνης, πατηρ τη μελλουστος αιωνος*, and from the other facts above stated by me, is, that the word *בן* was not originally in the text. “It is evident, saith Dr. Owen, from the quotations in the ancient

K k

“ fathers,

" fathers, that the LXX did translate them,"  
 [the words of the present Hebrew text,] " and  
 properly too, as appears from the Vulgate and  
 Syriac versions. For these versions, though  
 made (one of them at least, if not both)  
 from the Greek, are exactly conformable to the  
 present Hebrew, and have no traces of the  
 words, *μεγαλὺς ὁ θεὸς ἁγίος κ. λ.*" This obser-  
 vation is intirely overturned by the strong evi-  
 dence still remaining, that the words *μεγαλὺς*  
*θεὸς ἁγίος* were a part of the genuine ver-  
 sion of the LXX. As to the quotations in the  
 ancient fathers, Dr. Owen in his note z p. 50,  
 supposeth " the copies used by them, all of  
 them, to contain the mixed version;" but if  
 they all contained a mixed version, *i. e.* two  
 versions, they are of no authority for de-  
 termining to which of the two versions the  
 preference ought to be given. Of this the  
 reader must judge on consideration of all the  
 circumstances. It is probable however, that  
 the copies used by Tertullian and Novatian  
 contained one version only, *Magni Consilii An-*  
*gelus*. And as to the versions here men-  
 tioned, on which Dr. Owen so much relies,  
 the Vulgate is certainly of little weight against  
 the LXX and the old latin version; and one  
 Syriac version, or at least one copy of a Syriac  
 version, if we may give credit to Bos the learned  
 editor of the LXX, hath words answering to  
*μεγαλὺς ὁ θεὸς ἁγίος*. His note on these words  
 begins thus; " Sic Bas. legit, sic Cyril. &  
 " Procop. & Hier. juxta LXX, *Magni Consilii*  
 " *Nuntius: adducam enim patrem super principes.*  
 " Eadem præterea lectio est IN TRANSLAT.  
 " SYR, itidem in Arab. Quæ translationes ex-  
 " pressæ sunt de Græcis, ET ROMÆ HABENTUR."  
 These words of Isaiah, " the Messenger of the  
 great



great design," are equivalent to those of Malachi iii. 1, "the Messenger of the covenant." Our Saviour was, as St. Paul in Heb. iii. 1. observes, "the Apostle of our profession;" that is, he was a messenger from God to man. "Ye received me, saith the same apostle Paul in Gal. iv. 14, as a messenger of God, even as Christ Jesus." See Dr. Clarke's Scrip. Doct. No. 181. 916, and his letter at the end of Modest Plea, &c. p. 283. edit. 1719. Thus the version of the LXX is supported by similar expressions in other parts of the bible; whereas some material objections may be made against the propriety of the present reading of the Hebrew. The word פלא being an adjective cannot properly stand alone: and, as it is placed before the word עבד, it cannot, according to the rules of the Hebrew grammar, be joined in construction with it; though these words have been often so connected, and particularly by Bp. Coverdale, whose version printed in 1550 is, "The wonderous gever of counsayl." In Isaiah liii. 11. the Hebrew text hath the words צדיק עבד, which in the English bible are rendered *my righteous servant*: but the word צדיק, *righteous*, is omitted in three MSS; and, in Bp. Lowth's opinion, rightly. "It makes, saith " he, a solecism in this place: for, according " to the constant usage of the Hebrew lan- " guage, the adjective, in a phrase of this kind, " ought to follow the substantive; and צדיק עבד " in Hebrew would be as absurd as 'shall " *my servant righteous* justify' in English." And as to the words אל גבור, which are translated by bishop Lowth, as they were before in the English bible, *the mighty God*, can they be used concerning any other being than *Almighty God*? Concerning him they are used in Isaiah x. 21,

where they are rendered in the English bible, *the mighty God*, and by bishop Lowth, *God the mighty*. The LXX have there rendered them *Θεὸς ἰσχυρὸς*. In Jer. xxxii. 18. the words are again very emphatically used concerning Almighty God. They there stand thus, *הוּא הַגָּדוֹל הַגִּבּוֹר*, and in the English bible are translated, "the Great, the Mighty God;" and by Mr. Blayney, "the Greatest, the Mightiest God." This learned man in his note observes, "That הוּא is emphatic before the three words, and that we might render thus, The God, The Greatest, The Mightiest." The version of the LXX, according to the Roman edition, is, *Θεὸς ὁ μέγας, ὁ ἰσχυρὸς*; and according to the Alexandrian MS, and the Aldine and Complutense editions, *Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ἰσχυρὸς*. This latter seems to be the true reading of the LXX, and eleven Hebrew MSS have the conjunction *ו*, prefixed to *גָּבֹר*. If the words *הוּא גָּבֹר* were originally in the ninth chapter of Isaiah, and ought to be understood concerning the Messiah, and also be rightly rendered *the Mighty God*, is it not astonishing, that both ancient and modern Jews, as the truth is, should have expected only a man for their Messiah? See Dr. Priestley's admirable letters to Dr. Horsley. part ii. letter xi. I may add in farther confirmation of the proposed reading, *מִלְאֵךְ עֲצָה בְּיָדָהּ*, that the words *וְעַל* are omitted in one valuable hebrew MS. No. 30, of which Dr. Kennicott saith, "Plurimas variationes habet præstabilis hic codex, et scriptus videtur circa annum 1200;" and that the Chaldee paraphrast appears not to have found the word *וְעַל*, but *עַל*, which he hath retained. His paraphrase is, "Et vocabitur *וְעַל* nomen

“ nomen ejus a Facie *Admirabilis* CONSILII,  
 “ [מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִים,] Deus, vir permanens in Æter-  
 “ num, Christus, cujus pax multiplicabitur  
 “ super nos in diebus ejus.” *The Messenger of  
 the great Design* means the messenger of God to  
 men for making known to them his great and  
 gracious intentions for their reformation and  
 salvation. “ That the word *עוֹשֶׂה* here [Acts ii.  
 “ 23.] translated, *counsel*, signifies a *design*,  
 “ *purpose* or *resolution*, we learn from the use  
 “ of the same word Heb. vi. 17, where God is  
 “ said to be willing, or resolved to shew the  
 “ immutability of his purpose and design of  
 “ making Christ a priest for ever after the order  
 “ of Melchisedek.” 2 Hallett 287.

As to the second title of the Messiah מְבִי עַד,  
 though it be translated by the LXX and Vulgate,  
*the Father of the future Age*, yet I have translated  
 it, *the Father of the Age*, which is the exact  
 meaning of the words, and is agreeable to Sym-  
 machus and Theodotion, and also Clemens  
 Alexandrinus, who in *Pœdag.* i. 5. sub *Finem*  
 hath *πατὴρ αἰώνος* by mistake for *πατὴρ αἰώνος*, the  
 version of Symmachus and Theodotion. See  
 Bos; and Dr Clarke's *Scrip. Doct. Prop.* 1. in  
 the notes.

6. Of the increase of his government, &c.—]  
 The angel who appeared to the virgin Mary  
 alludes to this passage in the words recorded in  
 Luke i. 32, 33. “ He [Jesus] shall be great,  
 “ and shall be called the Son of the Highest,  
 “ and the Lord God shall give to him the  
 “ throne of his father David. And he shall  
 “ reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and  
 “ of his kingdom there shall be no end.”

13. The



13. The branch and the rush—] Heb. רֶמֶס וְנֶחֱמָן. LXX. *μυγαν και ρυχον*. The same Hebrew words occur in xix. 15, where they are rendered by the LXX *αρχη και ταχος*. Grotius and others understand the words, *branch* and *rush*, to denote the strong and the weak, *validos et invalidos*.
19. ——— the flesh of his neighbour.] The correction, proposed by Archbishop Secker, and adopted by Bp. Lowth, is indisputably right; and may be farther confirmed, by Zechariah xi. 9, where a similar expression occurs, וְהִנֵּשְׂאוֹת וְתֹאכְלוּ אֶשׁ אֶת בֶּשֶׂר רֵעֵהוּ, which part of the verse is well rendered by the LXX, *και τα καταλοιπα ταειδωτων εκαςος της σαρκος ΤΟΤ ΠΛΗΘΙΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ*, and by bishop Coverdale in 1550, “and let the remnant eat every one the flesh OF HIS NEIGHBOURE.” The English bible of 1599 agrees with Coverdale’s: but in the bible now in use the true translation is placed in the margin, and the text is thus, “and let the rest eat every one the flesh OF ANOTHER.”

## C H A P. X.

1. TO the scribes, who act wickedly in drawing up decrees.] Bishop Lowth’s translation is, “Unto the scribes, that prescribe oppression;” nearly the same as the marginal translation in the English bible, “To the writers that write grievousness.” They both give, with sufficient exactness, the meaning of the several words of the original; but the words together convey not any very determinate idea in either. Mr. Harmer (ii. 289—291) hath well illustrated this threatening from D’Arvieux and Sir John Chardin.

din. It appears from their travels, that it is a modern custom in the East for decrees to be drawn up by proper officers, and to be afterwards confirmed or rejected by the superiour magistrates. By this method the inferiour officers are often the cause of great injustice, the decrees, which are framed according to their pleasure, being more or less oppressive to others in proportion to the presents made by the persons applying for them. In this view of things the framer of an unjust decree is no less culpable than the person authenticating it. In order to express this meaning, I have been obliged to translate the line somewhat paraphrastically.

5. Ho! to the Assyrian; the rod of my anger,  
And the staff of my indignation is in his hand.]  
Bp. Lowth saith, that five MSS. for וְמִסְדָּהּ רוֹמָא read מִסְדָּהּ, and accordingly he omits the ו at the beginning in his translation; but this is a mistake, the reading of those MSS. being וְמִסְדָּהּ. The Hebrew will not, I think, admit the translation given by him; and indeed it is impossible, without some alteration, to make sense of the second line. As the Alexandrian and Marchalian MSS of the LXX begin this line with the words  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , instead of  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  the common reading, and are herein confirmed by the Arabic, and one Hebrew MS No. 96. hath the  $\text{בִּידִי}$  in  $\text{בִּידִי}$  on a rasure, it is probable, that the true reading may be  $\text{וְמִסְדָּהּ וְעַמִּי בִּידִי}$ ; and I have translated accordingly. The LXX, it is true, have  $\epsilon\gamma\ \tau\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \chi\alpha\iota\tau\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\tau\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota$ ; but this might be occasioned by the word  $\text{אֲשׁוּר}$  at the beginning of the verse being understood by them as plural,  $\text{Οὐαὶ Ἀσσυρίοις}$ .

16. ——— JEHOUAH, God of hosts——] Many copies have מן instead of מדי. See bishop Lowth's note. The LXX have only κυριος σαβαωθ, by which words they usually render the Hebrew words מן צבאות; so that they had not the word מדי, which now precedes מן, and which is omitted in two MSS. No. 1. and 126.

22. For though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea.]

“Esaïas, saith St. Paul in Rom. ix. 27, crieth concerning Israel, Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea;” and as the LXX have, και ταυτηναι ο λαος Ισραηλ ως η αμμος της θαλασσης, ο λαος σου, Ισραηλ, and the Arabic, “etiamsi fuerit numerus Israelis velut arena maris,” and one hebrew MS. No. 154, hath the words עסך ישראל כחול הים on a rasure, it is most probable, that the hebrew was originally in exact agreement with St. Paul's citation. The only difference between the Arabic and St. Paul is, that the former hath “the number of Israel,” and the latter “the number of the children of Israel.” The word signifying *children* seems to have been omitted by accident, as in Josh. viii. 27. it is said, “Israel took,” whereas it should be “the children of Israel took,” agreeably to very many MSS, all the ancient versions, and a MS. of the Chaldee paraphrase. See Dr. Kennicott's bible, and his Diff. Gen. p. 87. n.

Ibid. ——— shall return.] Heb. ישוב. The LXX, and St. Paul in Rom. ix. 27, with whom agrees the Arabic, have σωθησονται, *shall be saved*, and the same word is in Acts ii. 21. and Rom. x. 13. from Joel ii. 22, where the word in the Hebrew is יחלם, and the LXX have σωθησονται, as here.

“For



23. For an account, perfecting it and cutting it short in righteousness,  
Will **JEHOVAH**, God of hosts, take in the midst of the land.]

As the construction of the words in the hebrew and in the LXX is difficult and embarrassed, it is probable, that there is some mistake in both. If we omit in the LXX and Rom. ix. 28. the words, **οτι λογον συντετελειμεν**, which seem to be a marginal explanation of the words, **λογον γαρ συντελων και συντελειων**, and which, together with the preceding words **ει δικαιουσιν**, are omitted in Rom. ix. 28. in the Alexandrian and some other MSS, and the Syriac, Æthiopic and Coptic versions, the sense will be clear and in agreement with the context. Grotius and other learned men have been of opinion, that those three words, and also the words **ει δικαιουσιν**, are an interpolation in the epistle to the Romans; but perhaps these two last words are genuine. See Hammond, Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach. For **כלין**, which seems not to suit in this place, one MS. No. 226 hath **חכלין**. The true reading probably is **חשבון**, which in Eccles. vii. 27. is translated by the LXX **λογισμος**, and in the English bible *the account*; and, if it be the true reading, it is well rendered **λογον** by the LXX and St. Paul. The word is derived from **חשב**, which signifies *to reckon*; and in Matt. xviii. 23. and xxv. 19. the Syriac version hath **חושבנא**, the same noun in the Syriac form, for the Greek word **λογον**.

33. ———the Lord——] Heb. **יהוה**. LXX **ὁ θεοπατης**. See my second note on i. 24.

## C H A P. XL

2. ————— of JEHOVAH ———] The Aldine and Complutense editions of the LXX have *Kypis* in agreement with the Hebrew text; but the other copies of the LXX, and, according to Mr. Jackson on Novatian c. 29. p. 221, all the ancient writers and all the other versions, except the Vulgate, which hath *Domini*, have *tu* *Θεοῦ*.
4. ————— of the land.] So the translation ought to be, and not “of the earth,” as in the English bible, and in bishop Lowth’s *Isaiah*; for the country of Judæa is intended here, and again in this verse and in ver. 9. See note on ii. 10. and Whitby on 2 Thess. ii. 3. 8.
- Ibid. ————— with the blast of his mouth.] The conjecture of Houbigant, who for *בשבת*, with the rod, would read *בשבח*, with the blast, from *נשב*, to blow, which is adopted by bishop Lowth, is confirmed by St. Paul, who (2 Thess. ii. 8.) referring manifestly to this part of *Isaiah*, saith, “Whom the Lord will consume by the spirit of his mouth,” *Ὁς ἡ Κορυὴ ἀναλυσέι τὸ πνεύματι τῆς σφύρατος αὐτοῦ*. See Whitby and Wetstein on 2 Thess. ii. 8. and Whitby on 2 Thess. ii. 3.
10. And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, And he who shall rise to reign over the nations, In him shall the nations hope, And his resting-place shall be glorious.] The Hebrew and LXX differ essentially in this verse, and part of it is cited by St. Paul in Rom. xv. 12. agreeably to the LXX. As the version of the LXX, which is supported by the authority of

of St. Paul, gives a sense perfectly consistent with the context, bishop Lowth ought, I think, to have considered, whether we can safely rely on the present Hebrew as certainly genuine: But on this and many similar occasions it doth not appear, that he hath bestowed much attention on the difference, subsisting between the Old and New Testaments, in respect to the passages cited from the former in the latter, though the honour of the writers of the New Testament be materially concerned in the discovery of a satisfactory method of accounting for it. This verse was translated by him many years ago nearly in the same manner. See an excellent Sermon preached by him at Durham in 1758. p. 31. 2d edit. The Vulgate agrees almost intirely with the Hebrew; but the old latin version preserved in Novatian c. 9. is exactly conformable to the LXX. and shews, that their version is faithfully transmitted to us. See Mr. Jackson's note on Novatian p. 65, 66; in which he observes, that Cyprian agrees nearly with Novatian. As the versions of Aquila and Symmachus are nearly agreeable to the present Hebrew, it is not wonderful, that the Hebrew MSS now remaining afford little assistance towards correcting this passage in Isaiah.

The expression, *a root of Jesse*, is equivalent to those in the first verse, *a rod from the trunk of Jesse*, and *a cion from his roots*. "St. John, as bishop Lowth observes, hath taken the expression from Isaiah, Rev. v. 5. and xxii. 16, "where Christ hath twice applied it to himself." Mr. Mede hath the following note on the expressions in St. John. "CAP. v. vers. 5. "H. *ῥίζα Δαβὶδ*, et cap. xxii. 16. *ἡ ῥίζα καὶ τὸ γένος*  
L 1 2 " 78



" το Δαλιδ ] id est, 'ο ex τῆς γῆς, 'ο ἐν τῇ γῆτι, 'ο

" ἀπόστολος το Δαλιδ, γιζόμενος το Δαλιδ. Vid.

" Isai. xi. 1. "Works p. 909.

11. ——— from Shinear ———] That is, from Babylon. See Jackson's Chronol. i. 223; Mede's Works p. 272, &c. and the Chaldee paraphrase.

15. As JEHOVAH smote with a drought the tongue of the Egyptian sea;

So will he shake his hand over the river with his vehement wind.]

Bishop Lowth's translation is,

" And JEHOVAH shall smite with a drought the tongue of the Egyptian sea;

" And he shall shake his hand over the river with his vehement wind."

But a different translation was proposed many years ago by the most learned Mr. Mede,

(Works p. 529.) which merited the bishop's attention. Mede's explanation is thus; "Et

" *desolabit Dominus* (malim, QUEMADMODUM

" *DESOLAVIT Dominus) linguam maris Ægypti,*

" *et* (malim, ITA) *levabit manum suam super*

" *flumen* (Targ. *flumen Euphratem*) *in forti-*

" *tudine spiritus sui, et percutiet eum in septem*

" *rivos, ita ut transeant per eum calceati. Et*

" *erit via residuo populo meo, qui relinquetur ab*

" *Affyriis, (ergo Euphrates intelligitur) sicut*

" *fuit in die illa qua ascendit de terra Ægypti.*

" Videat Lector Zach. x. v. 10, 11. ibique

" Chaldæum paraphrastem." The Chaldee

paraphrase, to which he refers, is directly to

his purpose, and is thus; "Et sicut (וכנא)

" EDUXI EOS (Heb. והשבתיים) de terra Ægypti,

" ti, sic (כן) congregabo captivitatem eorum

" de Afiur (Heb. ומאשור אקבצם); et ad terram

" Galaad

" Galaad et sanctuarii adducam eos, et non suffi-  
 " ciet eis. Et fient eis miracula et magnalia si-  
 " CUT (כח) facta sunt patribus eorum in mari;  
 " et videbunt ultionem inimicorum suorum, UT  
 " (כח) involuti sunt viri in fluctibus maris,  
 " et confundentur omnes reges populorum, et  
 " cessabit fortitudo ab Assyriis; et Dominium  
 " Ægyptiorum auferetur." Mede's interpreta-  
 tion of the fifteenth verse is confirmed beyond  
 all doubt by the following verse. Mr. Blayney  
 in Jer. xxiii. 13, 14. hath in like manner ren-  
 dered two *vaus* by *as* and *so*, "As in the pro-  
 phets of Samaria——so in the prophets of  
 Jerusalem——;" and in his note he observes,  
 that *v* is thus used in the way of comparison,  
 2 Sam. xv. 34, and that the Syriac hath so  
 rendered this place of Jeremiah.

Ibid. ————— on foot.] Heb. כנעלים, and  
 LXX εν υποδημασις, i. e. *in shoes*, or *in sandals*.  
 The expression is equivalent to כנעל, כנעל, on  
 foot, in Psalm lxvi. 6.

## C H A P. XII.

1. And in that day thou shalt say;  
 I will give thanks to thee, O JEHOVAH, for  
 whereas thou hast been angry with me,  
 Thy anger is turned away, and thou hast com-  
 forted me.]

Bishop Lowth, in the introduction to his  
 notes on this chapter, observes, "That this  
 " hymn seems, by it's whole tenor, and by  
 " many expressions in it, much better cal-  
 " culated for the use of the Christian church,  
 " than for the Jewish in any circumstances, or  
 " at any time, that can be assigned; and that  
 " the

"the Jews themselves seem to have applied it  
 "to the times of Messiah." It is manifest, I  
 think, from the whole tenor of the hymn, and  
 from all the circumstances relating to it, that it  
 is intended for the particular use of the Jewish  
 church, when it shall be converted to Christia-  
 nity, and not, as the bishop supposeth, for the  
 use of the whole Christian church. It is imme-  
 diately preceded by a clear prediction (xi. 1—  
 16.) of the restoration of the children of Israel,  
 not only of the two tribes of Judah and Benja-  
 min, but also of the other ten tribes, and of  
 their happy re-union: and it is a song of exulta-  
 tion, expressive of their gratitude to God, on  
 this great and most important event. See my  
 second note on vii. 8.

Feb. 6, 1785.

M. D.

VIII. A



## VIII.

## A CRITICISM ON GENESIS IV. 26.

TO THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE KNOWLEDGE  
OF THE SCRIPTURES.

WORTHY SIRS,

AT the earnest request of a well-wisher to truth, and a lover of the sacred volume, I have been prevailed on to contribute my *mite* towards your great and laudable undertaking.

I only fear, that what I have presumed to offer may be altogether beneath your notice. If so,—your total silence concerning it will be a sufficient reproof and correction; yea, I shall consider it as a kind and efficacious hint to drop my pen, until I shall better know how to use it.

What I now venture to lay before you is, An attempt to throw some light on a remarkable passage in the Antediluvian History; even on the latter clause of the last verse of the 4th chapter of Genesis, which runs thus,

“—then began men to call upon the name of the Lord.”

Before I deliver my own sentiments on the above portion of scripture, suffer me to recite those of several great and truly respectable characters.

1st. Dr. *Lighfoot* renders the passage, “Then began *profaneness* in calling upon the name of the “Lord.”

It is observed that the word *חלל* from the root *חלל* may signify either to *begin*, or to *profane*; but  
surely

surely it cannot signify both, at one and the same time; and that word occurs but once throughout the whole verse. Though the doctor might use the word only for *profaneness*, and suppose that *began* must necessarily be understood and supplied.

But I cannot think the hebrew word, in our text I mean, signifies *profaneness*; since, in my apprehension, there is nothing in either the 25th or 26th verses to countenance such an idea. And I imagine that those two verses contain a complete and intire subject—in which no bad character is so much as mentioned. And *Josephus* says, “All Seth’s children imitated his virtues, and were of good dispositions.” B. 1. c. 2. § 3. Whist. edit. And I think the 26th verse neither an apostrophe, nor a parenthesis.

2d. Another opinion (and which is perfectly opposite to the foregoing) is that of the late learned Dr. *Taylor*; in whole Heb. Concord. No. 1706, signif. 1st. we read, “*Then began men to call upon*, rather “*to be called by the name of the Lord*, as his worshippers and servants, in contradistinction to the idolatrous *Cainites*. and others.” Dr. *Patrick* was of the same opinion.

3d. Mr. *Shuckford* says, “I think the Hebrew words verbally translated would be, *Then it was begun to call*, i. e. Them, *by the name of the Lord*, i. e. as I expressed it p. 12. they were then first called the sons of God. This is, I must think, the true meaning of this expression.” See his *Connec.* vol. i. p. 42. [comp. with p. 12.]

Mr. *Shuckford* likewise supposes the *ו* to signify *by* or *after*; and quotes some different places to support the opinion. p. 43. I think his further reasoning far from being conclusive; *Beth* as frequently signifies *upon*, as it does *by*. Page 294, he says,

" says, *Kara be shem*, is either, to *name by the name* (as I have formerly hinted,) or, to *invoke in the name*, when it is used as an expression of religious worship." See also vol. ii. p. 148.

But why should Mr. Shuckford say, "They (*i. e.* the children of Seth) were then first called the sons of God;" since the history gives *Seth* at that time, but *one* child, even his new-born son *Enos*?

4th. That great critic, the late Dr. Sam. Chandler, thinks differently from each of the foregoing; for he supposes, that to *call upon the name of the Lord*, should be read, to *assume to themselves the name of Elohim or Gods*. See the Doctor's Vindication of the history of the Old Testament, in answer to T. Morgan, the moral philosopher. p. 469, &c. which is a curious and learned piece of criticism. And the Doctor has spent several pages to prove, that our text should be read, *Then began men to call themselves by the name of the Lord*, *i. e.* to assume to themselves the name of *Elohim*, אֱלֹהִים, or Gods.

I must confess however, that all the Doctor's truly learned arguments have not yet convinced me, that such is the true reading. Nor can I imagine why he should have been so fond of, and laid such seeming stress upon *Elohim*; except that he supposed the use of that word would well support the idea he had adopted of *mens calling themselves gods*.

But, it is well worth notice, that neither אֱלֹהִים, Elohim, אֵל, Elah, nor אֵל, El, are so much as once found in the text now under consideration. On the contrary, the sacred historian has used a word, which one should imagine would have for ever excluded the idea that *men*, or indeed that any more beings than *one* were ever designed or intended to be understood—for the word made use of in our



text is such as hath no plural, even *יהוה*, *Jehovah*; which, it is well known, never signifies any other being than the self-existent, eternal and supreme Lord God Almighty: I therefore think we have full authority to say, that had *men* any concern in the matter, we should not in the text have seen the word *יהוה* *JEHOVAH*.

But it is time I should give my own ideas concerning the signification of the passage in question. And since, as far as I know, and verily believe, they are entirely and altogether new; I can have no recourse to great and venerable names to support me, but must either stand or fall alone.

I apprehend that verse 25 begins a new and perfectly distinct subject from that which preceded, and ends with the words on which I have been discoursing. And if this observation be right; then our text is not, as Dr. Chandler supposes, connected with ch. 6th. For he says, in the place beforementioned, “—in the days of *Enoch*, the son of *Seth*, “the posterity of *Cain* began to assume to themselves “divine characters and appellations. For thus I “understand the text: *Then began men to call upon “the name of the Lord*; Or, as the margin renders “it, *To call themselves by the name of the Lord*, i. e. to “assume to themselves the name of *אלהם*, *Elohim* or “Gods; *אלה*, *EL*, or *ELAH*, being one of the names “of *Jehovah*, who was *אלהם אלה*, *God of Gods*. “And that this is the true meaning of this passage “appears to me from the sixth chapter, which is “evidently a continuation of what was said in this “last clause of the fourth; the fifth chapter containing the genealogy interrupting the series of “the history.” But if my observation just above mentioned be right; then the words of our text could

could have respect only unto *Seth*; as I hope will clearly appear from the next observation.

Therefore 2dly. I apprehend it was the too closely following the common translation which occasioned all the abovementioned learned critics to give the text such a general turn of signification, as appears to me to be in no sense belonging to it. For they have all of them supposed the passage to relate, not to one, but to a multiplicity of persons, even to mankind in general, who were at that time in the world; or at least to a pretty large number of them. And this for no other reason, that I can imagine, but because we read in our bibles, "Then began MEN, &c.——"

But, by what means the word MEN found it's way into the text, I cannot at all pretend to determine. For I do not see any word in the Hebrew to answer to MEN in the translation.

The original is exactly as follows,

אֵן חוּחַל לְקַרֵּא בִשְׁם יְהוָה

Which literally rendered is,

Then began to call upon [or unto] the name  
JEHOVAH [or the Lord]

(Note, it should be remembered that ב, *beth*, signifies either *upon* or *unto*, in a great number of places. And Mr. *Shuckford*, (see *Connec.* vol. i. p. 304.) admits the translation of Gen, xxi. 33; which runs, "And *Abraham* planted a grove in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the everlasting God."

And the Hebrew is exactly as in our text, viz. (בִּשְׁם יְהוָה)

Nor ought the word *men*, as it stands in our translation to have any place at all in the text—(I mean according to my apprehension.) And this I think will be yet more evident, by observing in the

third place, that as I suppose the 25th and 26th verses contain one whole, and (in some sense) disjunct piece of history; so I think the words of our text belong not to any other person whatever, than *Setb* himself, on account of his new-born son *Enos*;—which undoubtedly raised very joyful sensations in his bosom; since in that *son* was his hope and expectation founded, that the race of men would be continued.

Can there remain then a single doubt, who it was, at the time when *Enos* was born, that——*began to call upon the name of the Lord?*

I think all those are perfectly right in their opinion, who suppose that *Adam*, *Abel*, and *Setb* were, long before the period of the birth of *Enos*, worshippers of the true God. See, among other places, what *Dr. Chandler* hath observed, in the vol. beforementioned, p. 471.

We are well assured that *Abel* was a real worshipper of *JEHOVAH*; for we learn from *Gen. iv. 4.* that “——*JEHOVAH* had respect unto *Abel*, and “to his offering.”

Unless, therefore, I am greatly mistaken, the adverb *then*, in the text, answering to the English word *then*, could not signify, *that* was the *first* time of calling upon the name of the Lord; neither could it relate to any other circumstance, than the birth of *Enos*—and the invoking, or calling upon the name of the Lord could have respect to no other person than *Setb* himself.

From the above observations, I am induced to read the whole verse, of which our text is a part, in the following manner, viz.

“*And to Setb, to him also there was born a son: and he called his name Enosh; then began to call upon the name Jehovah.*” i. e.

When,



When, or as soon as, a son was born unto *Seth*, he, even the same *Seth*, began to call upon the name of the Lord. Which invocation, I apprehend, was neither more nor less than a supplicatory prayer to the great almighty Creator, even in behalf of the young child, who had just been born unto him. The subject of which prayer I suppose to have been, that *the Lord God would spare the life of this his son; and not by his death cut off the whole generation of Adam.* This I have supposed, because I think there is great reason to believe that *Seth* was very fearful of losing his new-born son. Which fear I am ready to imagine was the sole reason of his naming the child אנוש *Enosh*, as signifying by that name that he was liable or subject to evil, misery, distress, sickness and death.

And, to say no more, I doubt not but *Seth* had very frequently before this time called upon the name of *JEHOVAH* in prayer; and therefore upon so very remarkable and favourable an occurrence as the birth of a son, nothing less could have been expected than that he immediately should *begin to call upon the name of the Lord*, to spare and preserve a life, in which his hope and expectation indeed were centered.

Thus are communicated the present real sentiments of

NISI.

When, or as soon as a son was born unto God,  
 he, even the same, began to call upon the  
 name of the Lord. Which invocation, I suppose  
 was neither more nor less than a supplicatory  
 prayer to the great Almighty Creator, even in behalf  
 of the young child, who had just been born unto  
 him. The subject of which prayer, I suppose to  
 have been, that the Lord God would spare the life  
 of this his son; and not by his death cut off the  
 seed of Abraham. This I have supposed;  
 because I think there is great reason to believe that  
 God was very desirous of saving his new-born son.  
 Which fact I am ready to imagine was the sole  
 reason of his naming the child with Joseph, as signi-  
 fying by that name, that he was liable or subject to  
 evil, misery, afflictions, sickness and death.  
 And, to say no more, I doubt not but God had  
 very frequently before this time called upon the  
 name of Jehovah in prayer; and therefore upon  
 to very remarkable and favourable an occurrence as  
 the birth of a son, nothing less could have been ex-  
 pected than that he immediately should begin to  
 call upon the name of the Lord, to spare and pre-  
 serve a son, in which his hope and expectation in-  
 creased.

The Lord communicated the promise to

Abraham of

---

---

# COMMENTARIES

AND

ESSAYS.

NUMBER IV.

---

IX.

CRITICAL NOTES ON MANY PASSAGES  
OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

PART I.

GENESIS iv. 11—15. Our version here is obscure and confused for want of proper attention to the distinction plainly marked in the text between האדמה, "the land" or "ground," where Cain then was, and הארץ, "the earth," in general. The passage might perhaps be more exactly translated thus:

Ver. 11. "And now thou art cursed from this land, which hath opened its mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand.

Ver. 12. If thou shouldst till this land, it would not continue to yield its strength to thee: a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.

N n

Ver. 13.



Ver. 13. And Cain said unto Jehovah, my punishment is greater than I can bear.

Ver. 14. Behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of this land, and from thy presence shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive, and a vagabond in the earth: and it will come to pass, that whosoever shall find me will slay me.

Ver. 15. And Jehovah said unto him, not so: whosoever shall slay Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him seven-fold. And Jehovah gave a sign to Cain, that no one that met with him should slay him."

The Greek version in the 15th verse hath *οὐκ οὐτο*, reading *וְאֵל*, which seems preferable. So also read Vulg. Theod. Symm.

GEN. iv. 16. "Land of Nod." Heb. *נוֹד*. The Samaritan has *נֹד*, and the Vulg. *profugus*, which confirms me in the opinion, that it is not the name of a country, but expresses the accomplishment of God's threatening in the 12th verse, that Cain should be "a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth." Accordingly we are told in this verse, that Cain went from the presence of Jehovah, and dwelt in the land "a vagabond," or "outcast," banished from the presence of God, which then dwelt with man, consequently from the society of his parents and brethren, who still dwelt in the constant view of this glory, or Schechinah, and met before it to pay their united devotions. We meet with no such land, as Nod, any where else.

GEN. iv. 20. "Jabal, he was the father of such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle: Such as have, being supplied by our translators, as if there was an omission in the Hebrew, which, according to the present pointing, runs thus, "the father of such as dwell in tents, and cattle." The

LXX however render the word, מִקְנֶה, ἀγροκτηνοποιον, by which it seems as if they understood it as the participle, from the verb קנה, and not the noun; and this I imagine to be the real case, and that מִקְנֶה did signify sometimes “to feed, or keep cattle.” The noun מִקְנֶה, *pecus*, derived from it, renders it probable; and we have the verb itself in this sense, Zech. xiii. 5. thus expressed in our version, “but he shall say I am no prophet, but a husbandman, for man taught me to keep cattle (הִקְנִי) from my youth.” There is then no omission in the text properly understood; and the version will be, “he was the father of the dweller in tents and the keeper of cattle.”

GEN. iv. 26. “Then began men to call upon the name of the Lord.” Heb. אוֹחֲלִי לִקְרֹא בְשֵׁם יְהוָה. Our translation here in the text seems a pretty exact version of the original; yet it cannot, I think, be its real meaning. לִקְרֹא בְשֵׁם יְהוָה uniformly signifies to pay God true worship, and it cannot be supposed, that neither Adam nor Seth were true worshippers. Our marginal reading, I believe, gives nearly the true sense of the passage; but the word “themselves” is arbitrarily inserted, and the phrase לִקְרֹא בְשֵׁם יְהוָה signifies, not “to call a person, or thing, by the name of Jehovah,” but “to call on the name of Jehovah,” or, “to invoke or worship in the name of Jehovah.” As then the proper and strict rendering of the words does not give us the true meaning, is there not reason to suppose an error in the Hebrew text, where a passive verb seems to be required instead of an active? Among the MSS in Kennicott’s bible, there are four that read לִקְרוֹא, the passive participle, and this small alteration will, I believe, remove all difficulty. The participle is often used, especially with the

præfix ל, in the sense of the infinitive, as Ps. xlviii. 1. מלל, "to be praised," which word occurs in many other places. Job. xxxvi. 31. למכר "to make abound." See also Levit. xxv. 23. Ezek. ix. 6. Ps. xlvii. 7. 1 Chron. xxi. 12. The exact literal version then will be, "then it was begun to be called by the name of Jehovah," i. e. then the custom of distinguishing persons by the name of Jehovah commenced. So Aquila translates it, "τοτε αρχη τε καλεισθαι εν ονοματι Κυρια. The LXX also render the word by επικαλεισθαι. The pious descendants of Seth, (for of that family the sacred writer is speaking,) began to separate themselves from all intimate society and communication with the race of Cain, who had run into a superstitious, and probably idolatrous mode of worship, and so began the distinction mentioned in the 6th chapter, between "the sons of God," the race of Seth, his true worshippers, and "the sons of men," the race of Cain, who had now corrupted both their worship and practice. Probably the corruption of the true worship of God, among the race of Cain, might take its rise some time before this, though not become so corrupt and idolatrous, as to occasion the above mentioned separation, and distinction, till the days of Enos. Cain, we read, was banished from the presence of God, that is, from the Shechinah, or glorious manifestation of his presence, which then abode with men, and consequently he was excluded from worshipping with his parents, and kindred. When he had a family, it is no unlikely supposition, that he might invent some other kind of symbol of the divine presence to supply the want of the true. This might give rise, first to a superstitious, and then, by degrees, (for men run not to extremes at once,) to an idolatrous worship among his descendants, which  
Cain



Cain might encourage, and promote (from the like principles of policy as engaged Jeroboam to set up the calves at Dan and Bethel) to keep up his authority among his posterity, and prevent their deserting him, which they might have done, had they gone to worship before the true Shechinah; for though Cain himself was banished thence, it does not appear, nor do I think it probable, that the sentence extended to his descendants.

GEN. vi. 3. "My spirit shall not always strive with man." Heb. *ידן*. The LXX have *καταμνησθαι*, the Vulg. *permanebit*; they read therefore, *לֵן*, "abide, dwell with man," which appears to me the preferable reading for the following reasons. It appears that God delayed the execution of this his judgment, the Deluge, for the space of 120 years, out of his great forbearance and mercy to mankind, as St. Peter informs us, 1 Ep. iii. 10. "The long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." Now the great end of God's patience and long-suffering is to give men time to consider their ways and repent. As then this space was allotted for their repentance, it does not seem probable that God at the same time would deny them the means of repentance, which must have been the case, if his Spirit had not striven, or pleaded with men in some respect, or other. On the contrary we are told, that Noah was a preacher of righteousness. The space, in which he was occupied in building the Ark, could be but a part of this time, suppose the last 20 years: all the rest of the 120 years were therefore most probably spent by him in preaching repentance to the world; and by him the Spirit of God still strove, or pleaded with men. And though God knew, that mankind in general would continue disobedient, yet some might be brought to repentance, and be finally saved, whom however  
God

God might not think proper, for wise reasons, to favour with the like temporal deliverance, with which he favoured Noah, and his family.

But if we understand the text of the Spirit of God not continuing to *abide*, or *dwell* with man, it may refer to his withdrawing the Shechinah, or visible manifestation of his gracious presence, which might yet abide with man; from which presence Cain had been excluded, but before which Seth and his posterity met to pay religious worship, till they also (the sons of God) being corrupted by their union and intermarriages with the descendants of Cain (the sons of men), God was now determined to withdraw this special manifestation of his presence and favour from them, for the time to come, to indicate more plainly his displeasure at their enormous wickedness.

“For that he also is flesh”—might be better rendered, “because he is indeed flesh”—wholly become carnal and sensual. Heb, כִּשְׂרָה, “because indeed.” כִּנּוּן often signifies, *certè*, “surely, indeed,” Gen. xxvii. 33. “I have blessed him, and he shall surely be blessed.” So it should be rendered Zech. iii. 7. “Then thou shalt surely judge my house, and shalt surely keep my courts.” The word “also” in our version is improper, as it implies some other being’s becoming flesh, previous to man’s becoming such *also*, but no other being is mentioned, or meant.

GEN. ix. 10. “From all that go out of the Ark, to every beast of the earth.” This seems to intimate that some beasts of the earth had not been in the Ark, as it makes a distinction between those beasts that came out of the Ark, and others that did not. This seems also the grammatical sense of the Heb. text, which is thus translated by Junius and Trem. *tum omnibus egressis ex arca, tum omnibus bestiis terræ.* So also Diodati’s

Diodati's Italian version, "*così con quelle, che sono uscite fuor dell' arca come con ogni (altra) bestia della terra.*" Which he endeavours to explain by the following solution, "*così con, cioè, tanto presenti, quanto a venire,*" which Patrick has followed. I suspect however that a corruption has happened in the Heb. text here. The words לכל חית הארץ, at the close, seem to be quite unnecessary, as every beast of the earth had been mentioned before, and therefore, it is likely, are only a repetition of the same clause from the line above, by a mistake of the transcriber, which is exactly the same as this except ובכל, and not לכל, as here. This conjecture seems confirmed by the 1xx Vat. which has not this latter clause, and, this being omitted, all will be clear, and consistent, and the version will run thus—"and with every living soul which is with you, with the fowl, with the cattle, and with every beast of the earth with you, of all that have come out of the Ark."

GEN. ix. 13—16. "I do set." Heb. נָתַתִּי, which would be better rendered, "I have set;" as most probably the rain-bow existed before the flood: but God then first appointed it for a sign of his covenant. The 14th, 15th and 16th verses also might be better rendered thus: 14. "And it shall be, when I bring a cloud over the earth, and this bow (הַקֶּשֶׁת) shall appear in the cloud. 15. Then I will remember the covenant which is between me, and you, &c. 16. When this bow shall be in the cloud, then I will look upon it to remember," or "as a memorial of the perpetual covenant, &c." ו sometimes signifies when and then; so our translators render it, Numb. x. 5. "When (ו) ye blow an alarm, then (ו) the camp, &c. Judges xix. 1, when (ו) there was no King in Israel, &c. 2 Kings ix. 2. And when (ו) thou comest thither, look out;" וְרָאָה, "then look out,"



out," it should be according to the Heb. text. So it should be rendered Joshua ii. 8. "and they were not yet laid down, when she (אִמָּהּ) came up to them."

GEN. xiv. 14. It appears from this and many other passages in Genesis, that slavery was very prevailing even in those early times, on which I would make a few observations. 1. I observe, that slavery must have taken its rise, and become very common before the calling, or even the birth of Abraham; for we read that when he came into Canaan—"he had gotten many souls in Haran"—i. e. many slaves, born in his own house, or purchased, for children he had none. See also xxvii. 13. 27. And we here find that the number of slaves born in his own house, and fit to bear arms, was no less than 318; besides the slaves that were bought, and the home-born female slaves, children and old men, all which together must amount to a great many more. Now so good a man as Abraham, one who worshipped, and feared the true God, would not, one should imagine, have conformed to a custom so abhorrent to justice and humanity, had it not been long established, and become general: circumstances, which, we know, reconcile even good men, to many practices, which otherwise would have appeared to them wrong, and even shocking. The same remark may be applied to the polygamy of the Patriarchs. 2dly, As slavery was become so prevalent in Abraham's time, so wars must have been very common long before his time; for wars alone, I should think, could give rise to the practice of slavery. Slaves were either those taken in war, or born of captives. 3dly, The two foregoing observations will form an argument in favour of the Sept. Chronology, as preferable to the Hebrew. According to the Hebrew account, Abraham was born only 352 years after the flood. In so short a period,  
it

it is contrary to the reason of things, and the usual course of nature, that mankind should have increased to such a degree, as to admit of frequent wars, and such a general practice of slavery. If Abraham alone had 318 slaves born in his own house fit for war, besides a proportionate number of purchased slaves, old men born in his house past bearing arms, and females, and children, what must have been the whole number of slaves at that time in proportion to the free, and to the whole number of mankind then existing. For others, especially Kings and Princes, had, no doubt, many more than Abraham. But the number of mankind 352 years after the flood, or even at Abraham's call, 425, will not admit the supposition of such an extensive practice of slavery as this; for that number, on the most advantageous calculation, must have been much too little to people, even thinly, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, part of Arabia, Egypt, and other countries, which, we find by the sacred history, were peopled, and formed into regular governments in Abraham's time; and much less sufficient to occasion such a prevailing practice of wars and slavery.

Let me add, that Noah lived to the year 350 after the flood, and died but two years before the birth of Abraham, according to the Hebrew computation. Shem lived after the flood 502 years, i. e. 150 years after the birth of Abraham, according to the same computation. How can we suppose, that wars, and their consequence, slavery, could so generally prevail, and to such a degree while these patriarchs were alive, who, one should imagine, would have had some authority, or influence over their posterity to prevent such inhuman practices—or at least, to prevent them from becoming so common and general? The same reasoning may be applied to the practice of  
 O o idolatry,

idolatry, which then so much prevailed, and will in this view also further confirm the computation of the LXX.

GEN. xv. 15. "The Hivite" is here dropped in the Hebrew text after the Canaanite, as appears from the Samaritan and LXX.

GEN. xvi. 13. "Have I also here looked after him, that seeth me?" This version seems awkward, and scarcely intelligible. Perhaps it might be rendered—"Have I indeed here seen the train, or, retinue, of him, who provideth for me?" אחריו seems to signify attendants, retinue, in Ps. xlv. 14. בתולות אחריה, "the virgins her attendants, or, retinue." In Exod. xxxiii. 23. we translate it, "backparts:" But what were the אחרי here referred to? God tells Moses that he could not see his face (i. e. the front, or full blaze of his glory); for that was so insufferably bright, that no man could see it, and live; but he should see the אחרי, the hindermost parts of it, i. e. perhaps, the train, that followed the principal glory, consisting probably of a glorious train of light, or of attendant angels, that closed the rear of the Shechinah. Thus Hagar here saw something of the retinue of the Shechinah, i. e. some glorious tokens, that followed, and indicated the Divine presence. She saw one angel at least, and perhaps some other appearances, which may be included in her אחרי ראי.

GEN. xx. 11. Heb. "and Abraham said because I said, &c." Samaritan, "and Abraham said because I was afraid, (כי יראתי) for I said, &c." which seems preferable.

GEN. xx. 14. Between, "Abimelek took," and, "sheep, &c." the Samaritan hath אלף כסף, a 1000 pieces of silver, which is probably dropped in the Hebrew text, as the LXX also have αργυρον μυρια and



and the 1000 pieces are mentioned in the Hebrew, verse 16. as given.

GEN. xxvi. 7. Heb. "kill me." The LXX more properly "kill him;" and then there appears no occasion for our translators insertion, "I said," to patch up a corrupted clause.

GEN. xxx. 11. בַּנּוּר. "With a troop;" or "a troop cometh," reading it as two words, which some MSS do, בָּנָה נּוּר. The LXX translate by ΤΥΧΗ. The Jewish doctors, with some others, follow the LXX, understanding it of good fortune: But that Gad signifies a troop here is evident from Jacob's expressions in allusion to his son's name, Gad, in the solemn benediction of his children, as has been justly observed. And we must suppose that Jacob was best acquainted with the reason, why his son was called by that particular name. To which let me add, that it doth not appear that fortune was deified so early; and we may observe, that both Leah and Rachel elsewhere uniformly mention God, or Jehovah on the like occasion, and not fortune. See chapter xxix. 32, 33, 35. and chapter xxx. 6, 18, 20, 23, 24.

GEN. xxxv. 7. "And called the place El-bethel." אֵל בֵּית אֱל. To call a place by the name of, "the God of the house of God", doth not seem a natural and proper manner of expression, and we never find the place called so any where else. The LXX did not read the first El, which seems introduced into the Hebrew text by mistake: the version then should be, "and he called the place Bethel," as in chapter xxviii. 19.

GEN. xli. 48. Heb. "of the seven years, that were in the land"—The Samaritan more properly, "of the seven years, in which there was plenty (הַשָּׁבַע) in the land"—The LXX also have ὁ ἔτος ἡ ἀφ᾽ ἧς.

GEN. xli. 56. Heb. "Joseph opened all wherein." Here is another omission in the Hebrew text: the Samaritan has, "all wherein was (בר) corn;" and the LXX. have σιτοβολωνας, which our translators have adopted—"Storehouses."

GEN. xlii. 16. After this verse we have in the Samaritan the reply of Joseph's brethren in its proper place. "And they said, the young man cannot leave his father; if he should leave his father, his father would die." That they gave this answer at that time is evident from Judah's account, xliv. 22. where he refers to it, and repeats it: but this reply is omitted here by the Jewish transcribers, because repeated further on, as they have omitted many other passages and speeches for the same reason, and as I suppose to save labour.

This passage, it is true, is repeated further on, ch. xliv; but there it loses half its pathos, as being only a repetition of what had been said before. The time, the occasion, the circumstances, when it was spoken, give it its greatest beauty and force; all which advantages are lost by omitting it in its proper place, when actually spoken. Nothing can be imagined on the occasion more simple, more natural and more pathetic. Benjamin was the beloved of his father; he did not come with his brethren, for his father could not spare him out of his sight. Joseph insists upon their bringing him. "He cannot leave his father, says Judah; if he should leave his father, his father would die." This is one of those strokes which seize the heart immediately. Methinks I see Joseph. His eyes are suffused, and with difficulty restrained from overflowing. His bowels yearn. I cannot realize his feelings; but I can imagine the language which his heart then spake. "I too was once the beloved of my father. What hath my supposed

supposed loss cost my venerable parent! how many tears hath he shed! what pangs hath he felt! and shall I now renew his grief, by depriving him of another beloved son? it shall only be for a time, to restore him both his sons with the greater relish and delight." Yet these tasteless Jews could omit *such* a passage, for the sake of saving their labour!! The speech of Judah, ch. xlv. referred to above, hath been deservedly celebrated, as an admirable instance of the natural, and pathetic. It is indeed inimitable. Sir Richard Steele, who, though a man of sense and taste, could at times both say and do a silly thing, scarcely ever perhaps did a sillier thing, than attempting to modernize this speech in one of his Tatlers. Like the Venus of Medici, it charmed with its native beauty; he put a modern dress upon it, and that native beauty was no more. Josephus has made another speech for Judah with equal success. Ant. l. 1. c. 3.

GEN. xliii. 28. After "he is yet alive," the Samaritan adds another clause, of which there is no trace in the Hebrew, containing Joseph's answer to their reply, "God bless the man." וַיֹּאמֶר בְּרוּךְ הוּא אֱלֹהִים. Which is a natural reply for Joseph, and undoubtedly genuine, as the LXX also have it, *καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος τῷ θεῷ*. In the thirtieth verse we have a natural and pathetic picture, drawn with the most simple colouring, but with the strongest expression. "Joseph made haste, for his bowels did yearn upon his brother, and he sought where to weep; and he entered into his chamber, and wept there." A feeling heart, as it reads this, is ready to weep with him.

GEN. xlv. 21. "And the sons of Benjamin were Belah, and Becher, and Ashbel." Here the LXX have an additional clause; *Ἐγένοντο δὲ υἱοὶ Βενιαμιν, Βελα, Βεχερ, &c.* which



which seems to be genuine, as some of those that follow appear to be Benjamin's grand-children, see 1 Chron. viii. from which it also appears that וּבְנֵי here should be בְּכוֹר, not "Bela and Becher—" but, "Bela his first-born."

GEN. xlvii. 16. Heb. "give you for your cattle;" a word dropped here is supplied by the Samaritan, לֶחֶם "bread," and LXX ἄρτους.

GEN. xlvii. 21. "And as for the people he removed them to cities, from one end of the borders of Egypt, even to the other end thereof." The LXX read differently from the present Hebrew, καὶ τοὺς λαοὺς καταδουλοῦσατο αὐτῷ εἰς πάντας. "and he made the people serve him (Pharaoh) as slaves, or, vassals." Instead of הָעֶבְרִי אֹתוֹ לַעֲבֹד, they seem to have read הָעֶבֶד אֹתוֹ לַעֲבֹד,

As the land was now become Pharaoh's, the people must in consequence become his vassals. This might be policy in Joseph, but the justice of it I leave others to defend. In our present Hebrew copies however his conduct appears in a less defensible light, that he should not only deprive them of their lands, and reduce them to vassalage, but turn them out of their hereditary possessions—force them from their old habitations, and paternal fields,—from their old neighbourhood, friends, and connections, all endeared to them by long habit, and send them to strange places, which they knew not, and which knew not them, at pleasure—This seems to be the height of tyranny, and treating subjects like servile beasts. For the honour of Joseph I would wish to adopt the reading of the LXX, which I find also confirmed by the Samaritan. Besides, this transportation seems inconsistent with what is said in the 23d, and following verses, from which it may be inferred, that Joseph did not deprive them of their old possessions,

sions, but let them still continue in the enjoyment of them on paying a fifth part to Pharaoh, as an acknowledgment of their vassalage to him. Which makes the reading of the LXX and Samaritan more probably the right than the Hebrew.

GEN. xlix. 10. Heb. שִׁלָּה—Samaritan שִׁלָּה. There is scarcely a word in the Bible which has puzzled commentators more than this. I am convinced with some others, that the word is compounded of pronouns, but am convinced also that a corruption has taken place in it, and that neither the Hebrew, nor Samaritan, are exactly right. My reasons are the following.

1. The Greek translators understood it as a pronoun masculine; the Vat. copy has τα αποκαίμενα αὐτῷ, other copies τῷ αποκαίται, and the old Κοινη read ὡ αποκαίται, according to the testimony of Justin Martyr, who accuses the Jews of wilfully altering it into τα αποκαίμενα αὐτῷ, Dial. Tryph. p. 348. Ed. Colon.

2. The Samaritan reads it without the (י), as a pronoun, but fœminine.

3. Many Hebrew MSS in Kennicott's Bible read it without the (י); no less indeed than 26.

4. The Jewish commentators, who interpret it, "his son," acknowledge that (ה) is here put for (י) (see Buxt. Lex. in verbo) i. e. they acknowledge a corruption. And further, they read it Shilo, masculine, and not Shilah, fœminine, as if conscious, that the word was written wrong.

5. The present pointed Hebrew confesses the excluded (י) by retaining the cholem over the ה.

6. Three MSS read it with the (י), and not the (ה), and another has שִׁלָּה ק in the margin.—Now putting all this together I would draw the following result.

1. That

1. That there has been a corruption in the word, as is manifest from the variation of the copies.

2. That the (י) should not be read, as the Samaritan and many MSS have it not.

3. That the (ה) has taken place of the (י); several MSS having the (י) instead of the (ה), and the Jewish commentators; and the Hebrew pointed text itself confessing the change of the (י) into the (ה).

4. The (י) being thus excluded, and the (י) restored, we shall have the proper pronoun masculine שׁוֹ, compounded of לוֹ אֲשֶׁר; and the sense of the passage will be, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet (from among his posterity) until he come, whose it (i. e. the scepter) is," or, "to whom it belongs;" agreeably to the version of the old *Koiné*, *ὡς ἀποκρίσται*.

Let me observe that there is a passage in Ezekiel; in which the manner of expression is nearly the same; with this difference, that the pronouns are not compounded but separate. chap. xxi. ver. 27. עַד בֹּא אֲשֶׁר-לוֹ הַמִּשְׁפָּט, "until he come whose right it is." Many instances of a similar kind of corruption might be produced, where the (ה) is put in place of the (י); but we need go no further than the following verse for instances of this sort, as עֵרָה "his foal," where the cholem over the ה detects the exclusion of the י. Buxt. in verbo עֵר quotes this text with this note, "cum ה loco י." Many Hebrew MSS read here עֵרִי, regular, and so the Samaritan. Several Hebrew MSS which have ה in the text, have י in the *keri*. The last word of this verse is another instance, סוּתָה, "his vesture," where the cholem over the ה still betrays the banished י, and in the *keri* it is regular, סוּרִי; the Samaritan reads כְּסוּתִי. These and many more instances, that might be



be produced, render the change, or rather corruption, of the ו into ה in שנה the more probable.

GEN. xlix. 15. "And became a servant to tribute." The LXX have *και ην ουδω δμω δουλος* (Similiter Aquila. Symmach. ap. Poli Syn.) In their copies, I suppose, they read, *אדם עבד*, "a husbandman," instead of *למס עבד*. This reading seems to me preferable, and more agreeable to the tenor of the context. The goodness and fertility of the land, which fell to the share of Issachar, would naturally turn the attention of that tribe to agriculture, to bow their shoulders to bear burdens, and become labourers or husbandmen. But free-born cultivators of their own lands are the people, who are least of all inclined to submit to slavery, and tribute.

GEN. xlix. 23—26. Not being satisfied with our version of this passage, I have ventured on another; with what success, others must determine.

23. Though his adversaries bitterly persecuted him,

And the archers shot their arrows at him;

24. Yet his bow abode in force,

And his arms were made strong,

By the hands of the mighty one of Jacob,

By the name [power] of the shepherd, (even)  
the rock of Israel,

25. By the God of thy Father, who hath helped thee,

Even the God Almighty, who hath blessed thee.

Thus far seems to relate to the past extraordinary favour of God to Joseph. The words *ויעזר*, and *ויברך*, which our translators render as futures, having each the ו conversive, should regularly be rendered as perfects; and the LXX translate them in the past time. What follows relates to the future blessings of himself, and his posterity.

25. The blessings of the heavens above,  
The blessings of the deep, which lies be-  
neath,

The blessings of the breasts, and of the  
womb,

26. The blessings of thy Father, which abound  
Over [or, beyond] the blessings of the an-  
cient mountains,

And the rich productions of the everlasting  
hills;

May they be upon the head of Joseph,  
And upon the crown of the head of him, the  
chief of his brethren.

The words of the 23d verse seem to be much con-  
fused, and out of their proper order. The Greek  
version restores them to their order, and corrects  
some of them, and also restores the parallelism  
between the two clauses, which was lost in the  
Hebrew.

“By the name” עַל־שֵׁם, in the 24th verse. The  
turn of the sentence, and the general construction  
of it, requires this sense of the word: עַל־שֵׁם, עַל־שֵׁם  
and שֵׁם, having a mutual relation to each other,  
“by the hands of the mighty one of Jacob—by the  
name of the shepherd, the rock of Israel—by the  
God of thy Father”—appear to be some of those  
parallelisms, which are so usual in the scripture-  
style. Our translation “from thence is the shepherd,  
the stone of Israel,” confounds the sense, and is  
hardly intelligible. עַל־שֵׁם often signifies the power,  
or providence of God, as Ps. xx. 1. liv. 1. Exod.  
xxiii. 21. By “the shepherd, the rock of Israel,”  
God is certainly intended. Jacob speaks of God  
in the like language, xlviii. 15, “the God, who  
hath fed me,” or, “hath been my shepherd.”  
—“ (Even) the God Almighty.” The Samaritan  
reads

reads **אל**, before **שד**, instead of **את**, and so do two Hebrew MSS. The LXX have **Θεος**, as if they had read **אל**, or rather **אלי**, as they add **μ**; but they take no notice of **שד**.

"The blessings of the heavens above" in the 25th verse. Our translators make "the blessings of heaven," &c. a continuation of the former sentence, and, in order to connect them, add the preposition "with," to which there is nothing answering in the original; and it appears to me from the whole form, and turn of the passage, that the first **ברכות**, and those which follow are nominatives to the verb **תהי**, or **תהינה**, as the Samaritan and many Hebrew MSS more properly read, and make one continued sentence. There is no **vau**, nor other dividing particle between them.

"Abound over [or, beyond] the blessings of the antient mountains" in the 26th verse. **גברו**. i. e. not confined to the limits of those mountains, but extending over, and beyond them. The Samaritan reads **הרי** for **הורי**, and so many Hebrew MSS; and the LXX have **ὀψέων**. This reading is confirmed by the parallel place, Deut. xxxiii. 15, where **הורי קלם**, and **גבעות קלם**, answer to **הורי ער**, and **גבעות ערם**, here. Perhaps Mount Gilead, which was in the portion of Manasseh, may be more particularly intended here.—**תאות**, "desirable things," rich productions, answering to **טוב**, in Deut. xxxiii. The LXX read the (1) before it, which the sense requires.

"Chief of his brethren." In this sense the LXX understood the word **נזיר**, both here, and in Deut. xxxiii. 16. **נזיר** signifies a crown or coronet, and **נזיר** was not only one, who was separated to God by a religious vow, but also meant one, who was distinguished from others by dignity and honour. Nazar is still a title of honour in the East. Sir John Chardin mentions one of the principal officers of the king of



Persia's court by the Title of the Nazar. See Harris's Voyages, v. ii. p. 335. In the account of the Alhambra at Granada, apud An. Register, 1719. an inscription is mentioned in Arabic, part of which runs — "Praise to God, and his vice-gerent Nazar, who gave this empire, &c." The author says in a note, "Nazar is an appellation of eminence, and supposed to mean the famous Emir-moumeline Jacob Almanzar."

GEN. I. 23. Heb. "were born," i. e. brought forth, "on the knees" יָלְדוּ עַל בְּרִיכֵי, "of Joseph;" which seems absurd. The Samaritan has better, "were born in the days," נִימִי, "of Joseph." Our version has turned it, "were brought up," which makes it sense, but it is not the proper meaning of יָלְדוּ. Our translators have also rendered it, "brought up," in 2 Sam. xxi. 8; but there it should be rendered "born," as in the margin; for Michal there is an error for Merab. Two Hebrew MSS read Merab.

Exodus iii. 6. "Of thy Father." So Hebrew, i. e. says Patrick, "of Amram, who, it seems, was a pious man." He might be so for aught we know; but the sacred history says nothing of his character. However, as the general stile in which God revealed himself to Israel was—"I am the God of thy Fathers, of Abraham, &c."; and as this is the very manner, in which he speaks to Moses, ver. 13, 15, 16. and iv. 5, it is most likely, that it was here too in the plural number; accordingly the Samaritan reads here אֲבוֹתָי.

Exod. iii. 14. אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי—It is generally agreed, that these words imply God's self-existence, and eternity; but translators differ in their manner of rendering them. Our version is, "I am, that I am." Others render

render them, "I will be, what I will be;" but these seem to be identical propositions, God's declaring, "he is, what he is." I should rather turn the passage thus, "I am, because I am," or, "I exist, because I exist." i. e. "I am without any cause of existence, but in my own nature."—"I am self-existent, and necessarily existent." אשר bears often the sense of "because, for, by reason of." So 1 Sam. xv. 15. "for," or "because the people spared, &c." 2 Sam. xii. 6. "Because (אשר) he did this thing, and because (אשר) he had no pity." Gen. xxxi. 39. "He called the heap Mispah, for," or, "because (אשר) he said, &c." If any should think this version, as identical a proposition, as those mentioned above, I believe, on a fair trial, it will be found otherwise. Any person may truly say, "I am that," or, "what I am;" and no body would dispute it with him. But he could not say with the like truth, "I am, *because* I am," in the strict and proper sense of the word, *because*; as his Being is not owing to any thing inherent in, and inseparable from, his existence in itself considered, but to a cause without him, and independent on him. But with respect to God, who exists in dependence on no external cause, who is necessarily existent in the strictest sense, no other reason can be assigned for his existence, but that he exists by a necessity of nature; "he exists, and will exist, because of, or by reason of, his self-existence. "He hath existed—he doth exist—and he will exist—because he *must* exist, and *cannot* cease to exist," is all that can be said of his existence.

Exod. iii. 19. "No, not by a strong hand"—which seems contrary to the following verse, and the truth of the history. The margin is better, "but by a strong hand." But doth אֶל ever signify nisi, unless? I know no instance of it. The Samaritan has,

has *niſi*, which may be right, as that word ſignifies, *niſi*, in ſeveral places; vide Exod. xxxiii. 16. 1 Sam. xxix. 4. and other examples in Nold. Heb. Part. The LXX reads here *οὐ μὴ*. Vulg. *niſi*.

Exod. iii. 22. Heb. "every woman," &c. The Samaritan has, "every man," as well as "every woman," and more correctly, as appears from ii. 2. where "every man is ordered to aſk, &c." as well as "every woman."

Exod. v. 5. "And Pharaoh ſaid, behold now the people of the land are many, and you make them to ceaſe from their labours." The LXX read the latter verb in the firſt perſon plural, with a negative before it, *μη μὴ καταπαύωμεν αὐτοὺς*, "therefore let us not ſuffer them to reſt, or, ceaſe from their labours;" which ſeems better. Pharaoh ſpoke not this to Moſes and Aaron, to whom he had ſaid much the ſame before, but to his own counſellors, or officers; which is more likely, as he aſſigns the reaſon, his jealouſy of their increaſing numbers, which he would ſcarcely have owned to Moſes and Aaron. A Pharaoh his predeceſſor ſays the like to his people, i. 9. Further, it is more natural to ſuppoſe, that by "the people of the land," he means his own people, the Egyptians, and not the Iſraelites, whom he regarded, as ſtrangers, and intruders. The Samaritan confirms this conjecture by reading *αὐτοὺς* inſtead of *αὐτὸν*. The text then with this double correction will run thus, "And Pharaoh ſaid, behold now they are more than the people of the land; therefore let us not ſuffer them to ceaſe from their burdens," agreeably to i. 9, 10. Egypt was then probably but a ſmall kingdom, conſiſting only of the lower Egypt; the increaſing multitude of the Iſraelites began therefore to be formidable to them.

Exod.



Exod. v. 13. "As when there was straw." So Hebrew. The Samaritan adds, נתן לכם, "given to you," which is necessary to complete the sense. The LXX also have ἐδίδότεν ὑμῖν. Straw they must have; but the difference was, that before straw was provided for them, now they were to provide it themselves.

Exod. v. 22. "Lord, wherefore hast thou so evil intreated this people?" I should rather translate the clause thus, "Lord, wherefore hast thou suffered this people to be so ill-treated?" The verb is in hiphil, which conjugation bears the sense of, "to let, or suffer a thing to be done," as well as, "to cause it to be done." In fact, it was Pharaoh that ill-treated them, God permitting it for a season. By the way, God evil-intreated the Israelites in the same sense in which he hardened Pharaoh's heart, i. e. by permitting both, not interposing to prevent either, leaving Pharaoh to act according to the injustice, cruelty and obstinacy, of his own heart, which miracles and the most awful judgments could not alter. This passage may serve as a key to the others here referred to, which have been much misunderstood, and abused.

Exod. vi. 20. After the words, "Aaron and Moses," the Samaritan adds, "Miriam, their sister;" which, no doubt, were in the text originally, as the LXX have the same words, and one MS, No. 686. reads ומרת מרים. See also 1 Chron. vi. 3. and Kennicott's Diff. Gen. Sect. 177.

Exod. viii. 9. "Glory over me, when shall I intreat for thee?" To boast, or glory over another may be the proper sense of חתפא (vide Judges vii. 2. Is. x. 15.); but it is a sense which suits not this place. The LXX have ταῖς, "appoint (me a time when);" the Syr. "pete tibi tempus." Onkelos, "constitue mihi

mihi tempus." Arab. "elige super me." They seem therefore to have read another word in their copies. Qu. whether נִמְנָן וְנִמְנָן—*declaravit*. Duet. i. 5. and xxvii. 8. "declare thyself to me, inform me." Letters of the same organ are often interchanged; as נ and מ.

Exod. viii. 19. "Finger of God"—better, "of a God." God, the only true God, most probably they knew not; but they were convinced, that here was the "finger of A God," whom the Hebrews called "their God;" and that he was too powerful for them to contend with.

Exod. viii. 23. "And I will put a division," &c. So our translators in the text, being sensible, that the sense required "division;" but in the margin, they have put *Redemption*, being sensible also that that was the proper signification of the word נִמְנָן in the Hebrew text, which never signifies *division*, but always *redemption, deliverance*. The LXX render the word διασῶς, the Syr. *distinctionem*. They therefore most probably read differently from the present Hebrew. To hazard a conjecture, it seems most likely to me, that the word was originally פִּלּוּת, a noun from פָּלַח; the mistake of פ for ל is easy, especially supposing the ל to be a little maimed at the top; and the verb פָּלַח is the only verb used to express the same thing through the whole of this transaction, as ix. 4, and xi. 7. In the verse preceding the passage in question we have פָּלַחְתִּי, which is a synonymous expression to פָּלַח, וְכָתוּב פָּלַח, "I will sever," or "divide"—"I will put a division."

Exod. x. 10. 11. Pharaoh, being requested to let the people go, asks, verse 8, "who are they, that are to go?" to which Moses replies, (verse 9,) "we will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our  
our

our herds, &c." To this Pharaoh answers, verse 10. "let the Lord be so with you, as I will let you go, and your *little ones*." Here Pharaoh consents to the request, which Moses makes him, to let them go, and their *little ones*, and confirms it by a kind of oath, or imprecation. But in the sequel, as it were with the same breath, he as plainly denies his request; "look to it, for evil is before you. Not so; (i. e. not according to your request) go now ye, that are *men*, and serve the Lord;" thus refusing to grant permission for their *little ones*, in direct contradiction to what he had said, and sworn before. And we find in fact, that it was not 'till after two other plagues, the locusts and the darkness, that he was prevailed upon to consent, that the little ones should go, verse 24. How is this to be reconciled? I observe that the Greek version has,  $\mu\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota$  (a transposition probably of  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\eta$ )  $\tau\eta\ \alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\lambda\omega\varsigma$ , (as it renders  $\text{וְאַתָּה מִפְּנֵי}$ ). I suspect then, that instead of  $\text{וְאַתָּה מִפְּנֵי}$ , the Greek translator read  $\text{וְאַתָּה מִפְּנֵי}$  ( $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\eta$ , *at non*); and if this reading be adopted all will be clear, and consistent, and the passage will run thus, "Let Jehovah be so with you, as I will let you go, but *not* your *little ones*. Not so, (or, *wherefore*; Samaritan,  $\text{לִכֵּן}$ ) go now ye that are *men*, and serve Jehovah, for that is what ye desired." The request of Moses to Pharaoh was at first of a general nature, "to let the people go, to sacrifice to Jehovah in the wilderness," but no particular mention of little ones; this perhaps Pharaoh takes hold of in the close of his speech. With the above alteration of one letter all seeming contradiction will be removed.

Exod. xiv. 7. "Six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt." To mention a certain number of chariots, and then all the chariots, does not seem natural, as the latter must

Q q

include



include the former. Besides, here is no mention of cavalry, whereas we find below, that Pharaoh's army consisted of them too. I should therefore rather translate it, "six hundred chosen chariots, and all the cavalry of Egypt." So the LXX understood it here, *παρα την ἵππον*, (equitatum.) רכב is a rider, or horseman, as well as a chariot; and the Masoretic pointing distinguishes them, though there seems an error in the pointing of the word here. Before points were invented, they were probably distinguished by a different pronunciation. רכב might therefore signify the cavalry of an army, as well as the chariotry. In 2 Chron. xxi. 9. the LXX again render the first רכב by *ἵππος*, (equitatus); and it is distinguished from the latter by the points. In 2 Samuel x. 18. it is said that David slew seven hundred רכב, and in the parallel place, 1 Chron. xix. 18. that he slew seven thousand רכב; now let me observe, that if רכב in those places signifies chariots, the verb used there seems very improper ויהרג: "He slew chariots," is plainly absurd, which I suppose induced our translators to insert the words "*the men of*"—here; and "*men which fought in*"—in Chronicles. The true sense of that passage therefore seems to be, that David slew 7000 horsemen, and 40,000 footmen: it is said indeed, in Samuel, that he slew 40,000 horsemen, but the book of Chronicles has more properly 40,000 footmen, otherwise there would be no notice taken of the footmen at all. The "chariot and the horse" in our version of Ps. lxxvi. 6. should be perhaps, "both the rider and the horse," as more agreeable to what follows—"are cast into a dead sleep."

Exod. xvii. 16. "Because the Lord, &c." Heb. כִּידָּעַל נֹסֵף. No clear sense can be drawn from this passage,

passage, as it now stands in the Hebrew text. I long ago conjectured, that  $\text{נֶסֶךְ}$  should be read  $\text{נֶסֶךְ}$ , and then all would be clear; and this conjecture is further confirmed by a Hebrew MS, N<sup>o</sup>. 665, which reads  $\text{נֶסֶךְ}$ . I also find since that Castalio had made the same conjecture. The difference between  $\text{נֶסֶךְ}$  and  $\text{נֶסֶךְ}$  in the Hebrew is not great, and it is less in the Samaritan letters; and this error might commence early, and before the Greek translation. This small alteration will restore the text to its proper meaning, as it gives the reason, why the altar was called *Jehovah Nissi*, which no other interpretation does. A  $\text{וְ$  seems also wanting after  $\text{נֶסֶךְ}$ , and then the version will be, "for he said, because, or, as my hand (hath been) upon the ensign of the Lord, so Jehovah will have war with Amalek from generation to generation:" i. e. by this sign, or token, he declares he will have war, &c. The ensign here referred to was the rod of God, which Moses bore, that sign or token of divine authority, by which he led and governed the people in the name of God, by which he performed his miracles, and which he held in his hand during the fight with Amalek, as the symbol of Jehoyah's guardian presence with them, and fighting for them, as general of the armies of Israel: and to this he most probably alludes when he calls the altar by the name of *Jehovah nissi*.

Exod. xix. 13. "When the trumpet soundeth long, they shall come up to the mount." This version doth not convey the meaning of the original, but is quite inconsistent with what is said in the former verse, and afterwards. Some indeed would expound the trumpet's *sounding long*, to mean its ceasing; but this appears rather forced, as a trumpet may lengthen out its sound without ceasing. I suspect an error in

the word במשך. Three Samaritan MSS have it שך. Part. Hoph. from שכך, *sedari, quiescere*. So the Syr. understood it, *cum cornu siluerit*; and the LXX and Chald. are agreeable to this sense. Then the version will be, "when the trumpet is silent, or, hath ceased, they may come up to the mount;" and all will be consistent. Our translators perceiving, I suppose, the inconsistency, seem to have intended a difference between this and the preceding clause, in verse 12, by rendering one, "*into* the mount," and the other, "*to* the mount," but in the Hebrew the word is the same in both clauses.

Exod. xxiii. 5. "And wouldest forbear," Heb. וחרית. That לא, *non*, should be read before וחרית, is evident from the Greek version, which has ". Then the sense would be clear, "thou shalt not forbear to lift (it) up, (but) thou shalt surely lift (it) up with him."

Exod. xxiv. 10, 11. I am inclined to suspect an error in these two verses. The pointed Hebrew is as we have translated it, "and they saw the God of Israel"—"and they saw God;" but from other passages it appears, that they did not see the God of Israel, whom indeed no man hath seen, or can see. They saw the glory of Jehovah, which abode on mount Sinai, and the sight of which was like devouring fire, verse 16, 17; and in Deut. iv. 12, 15, Moses tells the Israelites, that "they heard the voice of God, speaking out of the midst of the fire, but saw no similitude" of any figure, as a representation of God, to worship it. Now with all this express care to prevent the Israelites from forming any imagined likeness of God, these words, "they saw God," seem to me very inconsistent, and tending to countenance that very kind of idolatry from which



so much care was taken to preserve them. I have therefore been inclined to doubt whether  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$ , as it now stands in our printed copies, should not be read  $\text{אֱלֹהִי}$ , or  $\text{אֱלֹהִי}$  as it is frequently written without the (י); and then the version will be, "they saw the sign of the God of Israel," i. e. his glory: and so in the 11th verse, "they saw the sign of God." The Chaldee has it, "They saw the *Glory* of the God of Israel," from whence it appears not improbable, that they understood  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$  in this sense. Arab. *angelum Dei*. The LXX have  $\text{τοιοῦ}$ , and read some word in their copy, to which their  $\text{τοιοῦ}$  was intended to answer; what, it is difficult to conjecture, perhaps  $\text{אֱלֹהִי}$ . Chaldee, *locus*, a corruption of  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$ . Ainsworth, though he had no suspicion of the integrity of the Maloretic text, seems sensible of the apparent impropriety of its present reading here by his note on the words, "saw the God of Israel;" "that is," says he, "signs of the glory and presence of the God of Israel, for never man saw God, nor can see."

Exod. xxv. 19. "And make one cherub on the one end, and the other cherub on the other end: (even) of the mercy-seat shall ye make the cherubim." Marg. "(of the matter) of the mercy-seat." Junius and Tremellius translate in the like manner, "ex operculo propitiatorio facite cherubinos." All this is very obscure. To make the cherubim of the mercy-seat, i. e. of the matter of it, would be to destroy it, in order to make these cherubim. If it be meant of the like matter, as some commentators explain, the words do not properly express it, nor was it necessary to mention it again, as before it is commanded that they should be made of gold. ver. 18. The LXX join the words  $\text{מִן הַכַּפֶּרֶת}$  with the first clause, translating it as a genitive case,  $\text{ἐκ τοῦ καπνίου τοῦ δευτέρου τοῦ ἱερῆς}$ , I believe rightly. The version

version then will be, "and make one cherub on the one end, and the other cherub on the other end of the mercy-seat: Ye shall make the cherubim on the two ends thereof." *וְ* (which is but the contraction for *וְ*) sometimes denotes the genitive case, as in Hosea, vii. 8, "made him sick with the heat of wine" *וְ* *וְ* *וְ*. Or it may be translated, *on*, as our translators render it before in *וְ* *וְ*, "on the end." Either way will do here.

Exod. xxxii. 10. The Samaritan has a passage here, which has been dropped in the Hebrew. "And Jehovah was exceeding wroth with Aaron to destroy him, and Moses intreated for Aaron." Which transaction is referred to Deut. ix. 20.

Exod. xl. 17. After "second year"—the Samaritan adds, "from their going out of Egypt." Confirmed by the LXX, who have the same clause.

NUMBERS xi. 25. "Did not cease." Heb. *וְ* *וְ*. But our translators have put in the margin the Greek version "they added, or proceeded no further;" which is most likely to be the true reading, and is confirmed by the Samaritan, which has *וְ* *וְ*.

NUMB. xiv. 9. "Jehovah is with us, fear them not." I cannot forbear expressing my admiration of the conciseness, energy, and religious confidence, which so strongly animate this speech. We meet with some passages of the like kind in Homer, whose religious phraseology many times much resembles that of the Scriptures. When Telemachus is discouraged at the number of the suitors, and would persuade his father

ther to think of some assistance, Homer makes Ulysses reply with equal piety and spirit,

Και φράσαι, εἰ καὶ τοῖσι Διὶσι πατρὶ  
Ἀρκεῖς, ἢ τίς ἄλλος ἀμυντοῖα μεμνημένος. *Odys. l. xvi. ver. 260.*

Jove on our side, and Pallas warrior-maid,  
Say should I fear, or seek inferiour aid?

NUMB. xiv. 23, 28, 29. "Surely they shall (not) see the land"—These words express the sense of the original, but, methinks, all the spirit and emphasis are lost. The turn of the clause requires a question, which is very usual in the stile of scripture, and carries with it a stronger negative; and on this account seems to have been the usual form of swearing among the Eastern nations. I should therefore rather translate it thus, "But all these men, who have seen my glory, and my miracles, &c.—ver. 23, shall they see the land which I gave to their fathers? Verily." (It has often this force, giving a stronger emphasis to the sentence,) "none of these rebels shall see it." The latter part of the verse is an answer to the first. Again, ver. 28, 29. "Say unto them, as I live, saith Jehovah, shall I not so do unto you, as ye have spoken in mine ears? In this desert shall fall your carcasses." The energy of this passage our translators have weakened by altering the turn of the expression, leaving out the question in the first clause, and reducing the position of the words in the second to the same regular order of "your carcasses shall fall." See also the parallel passage, Deut. i. 35. "Shall a man of the men of this evil generation see the good land, &c." I shall mention but one place more, where the energy of the passage is weakened by altering the form of expression from a question to a plain negative, Ps. lxxxix. 35.

"Once



"Once have I sworn by my holiness, (that) I will (not) lie unto David." Here the emphasis is entirely lost; but the way of question gives force to the negative, and solemnity to the oath: "Once have I sworn by my holiness; shall I lie unto David?—אם לדור אכזב. A good translator should carefully attend to the peculiar turn and manner of his author's expression; otherwise, though the dry meaning may remain, the spirit may all evaporate. I observe this once for all, as many defects of this kind may be observed in our present version, by which the original greatly suffers.

NUMB. xxi. 14. "What he did in the Red-Sea"—a very obscure passage! But our version must be wrong, whatever may be right. In the text it is not בים סוף, "in the Red-Sea," but בסופה, "in Suph;" the name of a place near Arnon. See Deur. i. 1. where we find the Israelites encamped near the passage of Jordan, מול סוף, "over against Suph," which our translators again render *the Red-Sea*, which is too remote to have any concern here. Patrick, after others, supposes, that Moses here quotes from some authentic records of that country relating to the wars of Sihon against Moab, and justifies his account of his conquest from their own books; but that the wars of Sihon against Moab should be called "the wars of Jehovah;" or, supposing Jehovah to belong to the quotation, that the records of idolatrous Canaanites should mention Jehovah, as concerned in their wars, seems not a little *strange*. It appears to me most probable, that this book of wars was some account of the wars of Israel, written by, or under the direction of Moses, perhaps a collection of historic songs, which was the original method of preserving historic events of great

great importance. Such likely was also the book of Jasher. The Hebrew there however, as it now stands, seems to have no meaning. Probably it is either defective, or corrupted. Perhaps the LXX may give us some assistance, who have in their version, τὴν Ζωὴν ἐφλογισε; they read then a verb in the sentence, which does not now appear, and which yet is required to make out any meaning at all. The question is, to what their ἐφλογισε answered in the original text?

If I might venture a conjecture, I would suppose that after the words, בספר מלחמות, “in the Book of Wars,” instead of וזה את יהוה, they might read in their copy יהוה הצת להב בסופה.

(LXX, τὴν Ζωὴν ἐφλογισε.) The variations are but small; ה might be easily dropped in הצת, as an ה immediately precedes; א might be easily written by mistake for ז, and ל in להב written imperfectly, or obscurely might slide into (ו). With these corrections the verse will run, “wherefore it is said in the Book of Wars, (or, the Wars,) Jehovah hath kindled a flame in Suphah, and at the streams of Arnon, and at the stream, &c,” a very usual figure to denote the desolating effects of war; and it may refer to the war of Israel against Sihon in the places mentioned, as the like kind of expression is used to describe the war of Sihon against Moab, verse 28, “a fire is gone out, a flame,” (להב as in this verse) —“it hath consumed, &c.” — This last passage was probably quoted from a triumphal song of the Amorites on the conquests of their king, and which they might have commonly in their mouths; and we may observe that there is no mention of Jehovah in it, as in the passage above. The like expression is also used, Jer. xlix. 27, והצת אש, —“and I will kindle a fire,” and Amos i. 14.

NUMB. xxiii. 3—15. "The Lord will come to meet me." Heb. קרה. Samaritan, יקרא, "will be invoked (prevailed upon by invocation) to meet me." לקראתי, more regularly לקרותי from קרה. The verbs קרא and קרה are frequently written one for the other, as they seem to be in this place, in the Hebrew text. So also in verse 15, "while I meet (the Lord) yonder." Lord is not in the Hebrew or Samaritan. The LXX have  $\tau\omicron\varsigma \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ . The Hebrew here has אקרא, *meet*, the Samaritan אקרא, *call upon, invoke*. So also one Hebrew MS. The LXX read so by their  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . The reading of the Samaritan and LXX seems preferable, and the proper version is, "while I make invocation yonder," — or, "call upon God."

NUMB. xxiii. 23. "According to (this) time." There is no *this* in the Hebrew, and the insertion of it perverts the meaning. בעת, "in due season;" "according to the appointed time." In 2 Chron. xxi. 19. we render צאת בעת, "in process of time." —Our phrase, "a time shall come, when" —may perhaps express the meaning of the word in this place.

NUMB. xxiii. 29. "Seven altars, seven bullocks, seven rams." The veneration for the number seven began very early. We see that even at this time, the Heathens paid great respect to it in their religious ceremonies, which could not be borrowed from the Mosaic ritual, with which it cannot be supposed that they were yet acquainted; but must arise from tradition delivered down from the earliest ages. It might take its original from the seventh day being set apart by God, as more holy than the rest. There are several instances of particular regard  
to



to this number before the Mosaic law, as "the clean beasts by sevens," Gen. vii. 2. "Jacob's Service," chap. xxix. "Pharaoh's Dreams," chap. xli. I cannot here forbear observing, that there is a remarkable resemblance in the number, and kind of animals, between this sacrifice of Balaam, and that, which the Sibyl commands Eneas to offer, *Æn.* lib. vi. ver. 47.

Nunc grege de intacto septem mactare Juvenco  
Præstiterit, totidem lectas de more bidentes.

NUMB. xxiv. 7. "He shall pour the waters out of his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters:" a passage very obscure and difficult. The LXX have a remarkable variation here; their version is, *ἐξαλειψεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ κυριώσει ἐν πολλῶν*. They read then very differently in their copy, but what, it may not be easy to ascertain. I venture the following conjecture, merely to excite others to suggest a better. As to the first clause, for *יֵל מִבְּמִלְדֵּי* they might read *יֵל אֶדָם מִלְדֵּי* (*veniet homo ex filiis ejus*), *יֵל* for *יָאֵל*, א *omisso*, as *תֹּלִי*, Jer. ii. 36. *אֵל*, *profertus fuit*. The greatest difference is in the second word; in the last, except an additional (ו), the letters are the same, but transposed. As to the second clause, for *וְרָעוּ בְּמִים רַבִּים*

they might read *וְרָוֹד בְּעַמִּים רַבִּים*. Here is a change in one letter only, ר, for ו; the other variations arise solely from the transposition of the letters. Whatever the LXX might read, that they have given the most genuine sense of the passage appears probable from the Chaldee Paraphrase, which answers very well to it, and proves that the author of it read nearly the same, if not exactly. Onkelos (apud Patrick in loco) paraphrases it in this manner; "there shall

be a great king, who shall be anointed of his children, and shall have dominion over many people:" and the Jer. Targ. (ibid), "a king shall arise out of his sons."—Now the first part of this paraphrase agrees with the LXX in sense, though not exactly in words, but in no respect with the present Hebrew text. (The Syriac also is noticed as agreeable in sense in Pole's Syn.) The latter part, i. e. "and shall have dominion over many people," answers to the LXX exactly, both in words and sense, and thus confirms their reading. Further, they both point out one particular person, of the seed of Israel, who was to have this dominion, and the Jer. Targ. (apud Patrick) expressly applies the passage to the Messiah in the conclusion of the verse; "and the kingdom of the king Messiah shall be magnificently exalted." May we not then infer, that the Hebrew copies have been corrupted in this place, and that we have here preserved to us in the LXX, and Chaldee, a prophecy of the Messiah, which had been wholly obscured, and lost in the present Hebrew copies? Whether these conclusions justly follow the premises, I presume not to decide, but leave it to superior judgments.

NUMB. xxiv. 18. "*For* his enemies." There is nothing to answer, *for*, in the Hebrew. Better—" (even) his enemies," that is---Edom and Seir his enemies shall be reduced under his dominion. So LXX, *ἔσται ὁ ἐχθρὸς αὐτοῦ*. Samaritan *עשו איביו*.

NUMB. xxiv. 19. "Remaineth of the city." Rather perhaps, "of Ar," the capital of Moab, called, sometimes Ar-Moab, and sometimes Ar.

NUMB.

NUMB. xxv. 4. "Take all the heads of the people, and hang them up." It is not likely that all the heads of the people had joined themselves to Baal-Peor, and were therefore hanged. The Samaritan text is therefore to be preferred here. "Let them slay the men who have joined themselves to Baal-Peor." This seems to bid fairest for the genuine reading, as the repetition of the command of God by Moses to the judges is quite agreeable to the Samaritan, and by no means to the Hebrew text.

NUMB. xxv. 9. "Twenty-four thousand," but in 1 Corinth. x. 8. it is twenty-three thousand. Both numbers might exist in different copies. If the variation commenced, while the Samaritan letters were in use, the change of Gimel and Daleth was not unlikely; but some more antient forms, as represented on the coins of Simon Maccabeus in Calmet's Dict. vol. iii. are much more like, and may account very well for the variation.

DEUTERONOMY ii. 10—12. These verses seem to be an interpolation, perhaps first placed in the margin, from whence they crept into the text; as may have been the case with some other passages in this and other books of the Old Testament, and even in this chapter. But I take notice of this more particularly, as the interpolation is more plainly marked, than in some others; for it cuts in two the speech of God to Moses, and by a parenthesis in the midst of a speech, which has nothing to do with that speech, and which refers to a fact posterior to that speech, as already past, (see the close of the 12th verse) betrays its non-authenticity in the most glaring manner. Leave out these three verses, and the 9th  
and



and 13th will appear connected; the 13th is only the conclusion of the speech, begun in the 9th verse being the speech of God to Moses, in which he gives him orders how to direct his march. Our translators indeed add the words, (said I,) as if Moses was the speaker here. No such thing however is in the text, but it is the speech of God to Moses, commanding them to go over the brook Zered, not of Moses; and accordingly Moses adds, "and we went over the brook Zered," *i. e.* in obedience to this command. Jehovah ordered their march the whole way; see chap. i. ver. 2. chap. ii. ver. 3, 4, 18, 24, &c, nor did Moses presume to take any rout without his express command. Verses 20, 21, 22, 23, below, seem an interpolation of the like kind, inserted also in the midst of a speech of God to Moses.

DEUT. XX. 19. "For thou mayest eat of them— for the tree of the field is man's (life) to employ them in the siege."—There is no word for *life* in the original. Some would render this difficult passage, "Is the tree of the field a man to come against thee in the siege?" This version however is not agreeable to the present Hebrew text, which has מִן־כֶּסֶף, "from thee," not, "against thee." So LXX, ἀπὸ, and the Syriac. Perhaps this obscure text may be made clearer by the following version, "When thou shalt besiege a city for a continued time to take it by war, thou shalt not destroy a tree of it, by striking an ax against it, of which (כִּי) thou mayest eat, (*i. e.* a fruit tree): and thou shalt not cut it down, for is the tree of the field a man to flee from thee to the fortress?" (to the same purpose the LXX, but with a plain negative, *μη ἀνθρώπος τὸ ξύλον ἐσθλαῖν ἀπὸ προσώπου σου ἐκ τοῦ χαράκα*) ver. 20. "Only the tree which thou knowest

knowest not to be a tree for food, that thou mayest destroy, and cut down, and build a bulwark against the city, which is at war with thee, until thou hast subdued it." Here first is a prohibition against cutting down a tree, of which they might eat, *i. e.* a fruit-tree, which might be of use to them for food, with a reason annexed, that it was not a man to flee from them to the fortress to make any resistance, but might be of use to themselves; and secondly, a permission to cut down such trees, as were not fit for food, but might be useful to form bulwarks and works against the city. כִּי above has often the relative sense of אשר. See many instances in the note on Jerem. vii. 21, 22. So it seems to have here. ב in במצור, may signify, ad "to"—as the LXX here render it, *ως* *απαρα*, as in Judges vi. 35. באשר, בזבולון, &c. "to Asher—to Zebulun—to Napthali. 1 Sam. xvi. 3. "בזבולון" to the sacrifice, 1 Kings xi. 12. Hosea xii. 7. Pf. xviii. 7. Job xxiv. 5. and other places.

DEUT. xxxii. 8. This passage is allowed to be a difficult one. That God in his Providence did separate mankind into different nations, and appoint them the bounds of their habitation, there is no doubt, nor that he had also determined to give the land of Canaan to the people of Israel; but what is particularly meant by his settling their bounds, (*i. e.* of the nations above-mentioned, as the passage is commonly understood) according to the number of the children of Israel, I own myself at a loss to conceive. The bounds of the nations, as to the greatest part of them, were situated at a considerable distance from the land of Canaan, and had little, or no relation to Israel. The common interpretations do not appear to me satisfactory. "He made, says Patrick, such a distribution to other people

people (particularly to the seven nations of Canaan) within such bounds and limits, as that there might be sufficient room for so numerous a people, as the Israelites, when they came to take possession of the country." But this does not appear to be fact; for when they came to take possession of that country, they found it fully inhabited, and expelled the inhabitants in order to make room for themselves. Some have thought, that the particular division of the earth among the descendants of Noah's three sons was by the direct appointment of God, and that he then excepted the land of Canaan out of the general partition; and that this country was usurped by the Canaanites, in opposition to this express appointment of God, with which they were well acquainted. But there seems to me two strong objections against this hypothesis. 1st. That it is not founded on any sufficient scripture-authority. If it was so, it is strange we should have no account, nor any clear intimation of it. The only reason assigned for the expulsion of the Canaanites is, their extreme idolatry, and wickedness. But there is not so much as a hint, that they were usurpers, who possessed a country, which God had expressly forbidden them to possess, and which belonged to Israel, by a particular divine appointment, even prior to the grant made to Abraham. That grant, and that alone, is always referred to as the original deed, on which their right was founded. 2dly. It does not appear to me probable, that God should make such an exception, for had the land in question been thus forbidden to be inhabited, and left quite untenanted---in so many centuries, as past between the dispersion and the time in which Israel took possession, it would have been so overgrown with woods, and so overrun by wild beasts, as not to be at all fit for the immediate possession,



session and maintenance of so numerous a nation; and it would have required a long course of time to have fully cleared, and cultivated it. Whereas, as the affair actually happened, the land was cleared, and cultivated, and towns and cities built; so that it was well prepared for their reception, and to afford them an immediate, and plentiful subsistence. This observation will be sufficiently confirmed by what God says, *Exod. xxiii. 29, 30.* "that he would not drive out the nations before them in *one* year, lest the land should become desolate, and the beasts of the field should multiply against them, but by little and little." The inference is obvious.---On the whole, it appears to me, that the passage would be clear and intelligible, if we were to understand עַמִּי to refer, not to the *Gentiles*, but to the *People of Israel*. Then the meaning would be, "that when God, by his providential disposition of things, separated mankind into different nations, and appointed them their inheritance, he did then in his fore-knowledge settle the bounds of the (Hebrew) people, according to the number of the sons of Jacob, or Israel, *i. e.* according to their twelve tribes." He then determined to divide the land among them by their twelve tribes, and in proportion to each tribe, which appointment he had now revealed to them very particularly, (see *Numbers chap. xxxiv.*) and thus had shewn his peculiar regard to Israel, because he had chosen them for his own portion, and inheritance. עַמִּי, plural, is often used to denote a single people, and the people of Israel in particular. *Exod. xxx. 33.* מֵעַמִּי, "from his peoples," and frequently elsewhere. *Numbers xx. 24.* אֶל עַמִּי "to his peoples." *chap. xxvii. ver. 13.* "to thy peoples." *Deut. xxxiii. 3.* "he loved the peoples (of Israel) עַמִּים. *Pf. xlvii. 9.* נִחַם עַמִּים נִחַם

עם, where עם and עַם are used indifferently to express the *one people* of Israel, Levit. chap. xxi. verses 1, 4, 15. Judges v. 14. בעַמִּיךָ "with thy peoples," spoken of the single tribe of Benjamin.

DEUT. xxxii. 39. אֲנִי אֵלֹהִים—It appears to me, that, whenever God is introduced speaking in this manner, "I am he," the word *he*, אֲנִי, relates to his peculiar name, Jehovah; "I am HE"—*i. e.* Jehovah, the self-existent, the only true God; and that the name Jehovah is always understood to be meant, and referred to: for want of attending to which, the true import and energy of many passages are lost. The following texts seem to explain the meaning and design of the phrase. Is. xli. 4. "I am Jehovah, the first, and with the last. I am HE, אֲנִי," *i. e.* Jehovah, Is. xliii. 10, 11. "That ye may know that I am HE." Who? Answer, ver. 11. I, even I, am Jehovah, Is. xlvi. 9—12. "For my name's sake will I defer mine anger. For mine own sake will I do it; for how should (my name, *LXX* τὸ ὄνομα, and one MS. שֵׁם) be polluted"—"I am HE"—referring to his name before mentioned. Is. lii. 6. "Therefore my people shall know my name, that I am HE (*i. e.* Jehovah), that doth speak, behold it is I." Jer. xiv. 22. "Art not thou HE, Jehovah, our God?" Perhaps then Ps. cii. ver. 27. might be better rendered, "but thou art HE." *i. e.* Jehovah, the self-existent, the everlasting God.

DEUT. xxxiii. 4. "Moses commanded us a law"—That the word Moses here is an error I have no doubt: this verse, and the following evidently relate to Jehovah.—"He commanded"—"He was king"—the only king of Israel. Moses never assumed

ed that title. Query then, whether משה may not be a mistake for משה, "thence." *i. e.* Mount Sinai above mentioned. "He commanded us a law from thence."

DEUT. xxxiii. 6. "And let (not) his men be few." The Hebrew phrase here is not מתי מספר, "men of number," which implies a few, such as may be easily reckoned, but מתי מספר, "and let his men be a number," which implies *many*. LXX πολὺς ἐν ἀριθμῷ; so that there is no occasion for inserting a negative. There is a difference in the two phrases; in the first case, מתי is in regimine with the following word; in the latter מתי is independent on מספר, and governs its own affix; and their import is therefore different. The LXX (Alex.) have συμειν here, which is most probably right; it not being likely, that this tribe should be wholly omitted, καὶ συμειν ἐξω πολὺς ἐν ἀριθμῷ. So also the Aldine and Complutense editions.

DEUT. xxxiv. 1---3. Here is a remarkable variation in the Samaritan Pentateuch, which reads, "all the land from the river of Egypt, to the river, the great river Euphrates, to the utmost Sea." Moses's prospect in the Hebrew text reaches from Dan North, to Zoar South; but in the Samaritan it is much more extensive, reaching on the North-East to the Euphrates, and on the South to the confines of Egypt. *i. e.* all the land that God had promised Abraham to give to his seed. Gen. xv. 18. which comprehended all from the river Euphrates to the river of Egypt; and which promise was renewed Deut. i. 7. xi. 24. See also Josh. i. 4. All which was actually under the dominion of Israel, in the reigns of David, and Solomon: and in 1 Chron. v. 9.



we read of the Reubenites possessing the country eastwards to the Euphrates.

JUDGES iv. 8. In the Hebrew text here Barak gives no reason, why he would not go without Deborah; but in the Greek version, we have a reason assigned by him, *i. e.* because he knew not the day when Jehovah would by his angel give success to his enterprise, *οτι ουκ οίδα την ημεραν εν η ενοδοι Κυριος τοι αγγελοι μετ' αυου.* Deborah being a prophetess, he was willing to have her directions, when to attack the enemy. This clause was probably in the Hebrew originally, which seems confirmed by ver. 14, where Deborah doth so direct him, "Up, for this is the day, &c." referring to this reason of Barak.

JUDGES v. 13, 14. Our version of these verses doth not seem accurate, and there are some difficulties in the text. I offer the following version to the consideration of better judges; premising, that Deborah is here enumerating the forces, which joined, and assisted her, and had a share in the victory here celebrated.

"Then the remnant came down to the nobles,

"The people of Jehovah came down to me with the mighty men.

"Some of Ephraim destroyed them in Amalek,

"Following thee, O Benjamin, with thy people.

"Out of Machir came down the rulers,

"And out of Zebulon, those that handle the pen of the scribe."

Or, "And out of Zebulon, those that wield the scepter."

To illustrate this version, I would observe :

1st. That the meaning of יר here seems fixed by the use of the same word in the 14th verse, where it certainly

certainly means "to come down." The LXX so render it in each place, where it occurs in these two verses, κατεβη, κατεβησαν. "The remnant," שריד the people that had escaped the sword of the Canaanites, "came down to the nobles," i. e. to join with them, offering themselves voluntarily for the enterprize. See ver. 2. 9.

2dly. "The people of Jehovah." Our version connects עם and לאדירים together, "over the nobles among the people," but there is nothing in the original to answer the preposition, "among." The LXX more properly connect עם with "Jehovah," λαος Κυριου.—There is designed a parallelism in the two clauses of this verse, which our version destroys, שריד and אדירים in the first, answer to עם and נברים in the second.

3dly. מני אפרים may signify "some of Ephraim." מ, and מן, have this signification in many places. 2 Chron. xx. 1. מן העמונים, "Some of the Ammonites," (rather Maonites, vide LXX Μιναίων). Gen. xxxiii. 15, מן העם. "Some of the people." Jer. xxxix. 10. Levit. iv. 7, 17. 1 Chron. xl. 20. Dan. viii. 10.

4thly. "Destroyed them." שרשם should probably be שרשום, otherwise there will be a verb wanting here, and no sense. The LXX understood it as a verb, Εφραιμ εξερριζωσεν αυτους; Ephraim rooted them out in Amalek. That Mount Amalek in Ephraim is meant here is most likely, as that was near the scene of action.

5th. "Those that handle the pen of the scribe." The scribes probably were much the same as the מוקקים, those that had the management of public affairs, and the keeping of the public registers. Jonathan, David's uncle, was a counsellor, a wise man, and a scribe, see 1 Chron. xxvii. 32. The office of  
scribe

scribe was then of great dignity and importance, and they had the chief employments in the government.

Or if we suppose that this hemistich should end with **בשבט**, and **ספר** should begin the following verse—**ספרו**—the version will be, “those that wield the scepter,” or, “stretch out the scepter.” **משך** signifies, “to stretch, extend.” Hosea vii. 5, “stretch out his hand.” Ps. cix. 12. Ps. xxxvi. 10.

JUDGES ix. 38. “Where is now thy mouth, (wherewith) thou saidst.” It would be better, “Where is the speech, which thou didst utter.” **פה** often signifies some particular speech, word, or commandment, as Joshua xxii. 9. “According to the word of Jehovah (**פי ידוה**) by the ministry (**בד**) of Moses.”

JUDGES ix. 41. “Dwelt at Arumah.” Perhaps better in military phrase “encamped.”

JUDGES x. 8. “And that year they vexed and oppressed the children of Israel eighteen years.” Scarcely intelligible. **בשנה הוא**, should be translated, “from that year they vexed, &c.” **ב** often signifies, “from.” So we translate it, 2 Kings xiv. 13. “from the gate (**בשער**) of Ephraim to, &c.” See also the LXX in Exodus xliii. 27. **απο της ημερας (ביום) της παλαιας**; and Ezek. xliii. 27. **απο της ημερας (ביום) της οστεως**.

JUDGES x. 12. “Maonites,” **מאון**. We read before of no such nation oppressing and subduing Israel. The LXX read **Μαδιμ**, which is more likely.

JUDGES



JUDGES xii. 7. In the Hebrew it is said, that Jephthah was buried in the cities of Gilead; but he could not be buried in more cities than one. Our translators have therefore supplied, "one of;" but still this doth not inform us *which*. In the LXX we have *ἐν πόλει αὐτοῦ*, "in his own city," (*i. e.* Mispah of Gilead, vide chap. xi. ver. 34.) For עיר then we should read עירו, "in his own city."

JUDGES xviii. 7. Query; whether ערש עזר here, which has so puzzled the critics, might not have been originally עשר ועזר the letters having been since transposed and one a little altered, *i. e.* (ו) into (י), an easy error. Then the version will be, "nor prince, nor governor," which will give us a clear sense. Laish was probably a colony of the Sidonians.

JUDGES xix. 2. "His concubine played the whore." The LXX *ἑπορεύθη*, "eloped." Josephus, *ἀλλοτριώσας ἑαυτήν*. Perhaps he read in his copy תורה or תורה (אור, *alienatus fuit*;) instead of תונה.

1 SAM. i. 18. "Her countenance was no more (sad)." Here seems an omission, which is supplied by our translators. Perhaps it is rather a corruption: the LXX have *καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς ἠσυχώθη*; by which it appears, that instead of לא חיו לה עוד they read לא נפלו עוד

"And her countenance was no longer fallen," which is a usual expression for a sad countenance. See Gen. iv. 5, where we have the same phrase.

1 SAM. i. 28. "And he worshipped." Better perhaps, "and they worshipped," (*i. e.*) both parents. Vulg. Syr. Ar. read it plural.

1 SAM.

1 SAM. ii. 5. "And (they that were) hungry ceased: so that the barren hath borne seven, &c." ער—ורבעם חדלו ער probably belongs not to the following clause, where it only confounds the sense, but to this. Perhaps we should read ער אכלו, "and the hungry have eaten the prey." This would make a proper opposition, which seems designed, as in the adjoining clauses; and then the next clause would be delivered from its embarrassment, "so that." In Gen. xlix. 27, we have the same phrase, ער אכל "he shall devour, or, eat the prey." The Vulgate has, "saturati sunt." It did not then read ער, but it might read אכלו. א and ה differed not much from each other in sound, a and ha—and כ imperfectly written might be mistaken for ג. Then the version would run thus:

"They that were full have hired themselves out for bread;

"And they that were hungry have eaten the prey:

"The barren hath borne seven, &c."

1 SAM. ii. 31. "There shall not be an old man in thine house." So Hebrew: but in the LXX, "I will destroy thy seed, and the seed of thy father's house," (reading more properly זרע for זרוע), "and there shall not be unto thee an old man in my house for ever." Meaning, not that there should not be an old man in the family of Eli throughout all future generations, but that there should be none of that family, who should enjoy the priesthood in the house of God, to any great age; which seems a more probable sense. Abiathar lost the priesthood before he arrived to what was then esteemed a great age. His father Ahimelech died a violent and premature

mature death. Of his predecessors, we are not in this respect informed.

1 SAM. ii. 32. There is great obscurity in this passage, and I question, whether its true sense hath yet been hit. There seems some error in the text; but two MSS read ככל instead of בכל, which will probably let us into the true meaning. The sense then may be, "and thou shalt see an affliction in my house" (*i. e.* the capture of the Ark) "in proportion to," *i. e.* as great and signal as, "all the good, which Jehovah hath (hitherto) done to Israel." כ signifies, "as, such as, according to, in proportion to;" thus Ps. xci. 15. "make us glad according to the days (כימור) wherein thou hast afflicted us, &c.\*" This sense seems to suit this place. One MS reads, יחור, after ישיב, and כ seems required before מען.

1 SAM. ii. 33. "Shall die in the flower of their age." Heb. "shall die men," אנשים. This is obscure; I should prefer the reading of the LXX, "shall die by the sword of men," εν χειρὶ ἀνδρῶν, which shows that בחרב is omitted in the Hebrew text. This was verified in the slaughter of his sons, and the murder of his family by Doeg. I should also prefer the reading of the LXX in the former part of the verse — "his eyes," and, "his heart," not, "thine eyes," and, "thine heart." Eli dying just after this threatening could not have his eyes consumed by the calamities of his surviving posterity. But this threatening was fulfilled in Abiathar, who, after having been high-priest all the reign of David, ended

\* Hosea ix. 10. שְׂקִיָּם כְּאֹהֲבִים, "hated as much as they had been loved," LXX read כְּאֹהֲבִים.



ended his life in disgrace and sorrow; and it is referred to as belonging to him, 1 Kings ii. 27, which confirms the reading of the LXX.

I SAM. v. 8. At the close of the verse "Gath" is dropped in the Hebrew. LXX <sup>as</sup> Γαθ, and one MS hath it.

I SAM. ix. 24. "For unto this time hath it been kept for thee, (since) I said, I have invited the people." The original seems obscure, and confused, as well as this version. The LXX render <sup>as</sup> <sup>μυστηριον</sup>, which may help to clear the sense. Neither the LXX nor Vulg. appear to have read <sup>as</sup> לאמר, which embarrasses the sense here; the Vulg. has *quando*, as if it read באשר. Admitting these variations, we shall have a clear meaning; "for it was, or, hath been, reserved for thee for a testimony, since, or, from the time I invited the people;" i. e. when I invited the people, I gave orders that the shoulder should be reserved for thee, as a testimony to thee before them; meaning, that when he should be declared their king, they remembering the testimony, or distinction, that was now paid him, as their superior, though unknown, might be more thoroughly convinced of his divine designation. In the beginning of this verse Samuel is dropped in the Hebrew, where it is, "the cook said." Our translators have rightly supplied it from the LXX.

I SAM. xii. 21. כ here is evidently redundant, and embarrasses the sense; to make out which our translators supply very awkwardly, "should ye go." The LXX did not read it, nor the Vulgate. It was perhaps taken in from the latter part of this verse, which might more easily happen as it follows a *vau*.  
This

This omitted the sense is clear, "and turn not aside after vain things," *i. e.* idols.

1 SAM. xv. 12. "Set him up a hand," better, "a pillar," of memorial for his victory. יָד is used as equivalent to מַצֵּבָה, 2 Sam. xviii. 18. "Absalom's memorial."

1 SAM. xvi. 10. "Again Jesse made seven of his sons to pass." Three had passed before, and by the word, *again*, our translators seem to tell us, that he made seven more of his sons to pass before Samuel, besides the three before mentioned, and so common readers understand it. But there is no word for "again," and the (ו) before עָבַר will not, we see, admit of that sense here. The plain meaning is, that Jesse made seven of his sons, (including those particularly named before,) to pass before Samuel, David, the 8th, being then absent. But here arises another difficulty. By this account Jesse had eight sons, of which David was the 8th; but in 1 Chron. ii. 13—15, where we have a more particular account of the sons of Jesse, there are reckoned but seven, and David the seventh. I am inclined therefore to suspect there may be an error of the transcribers here in Samuel, and that instead of *seven* sons, we should read *six*, and then it will perfectly agree with Chronicles; the letters 1—6, and 1—7, are so very like, that the latter might be easily written for the former: and from hence the account of Jesse's having eight sons in chap. xvii. ver. 12, may have been taken, being the first verse of the long interpolated passage (as I have no doubt it is) in the history of David and Goliath.

1 SAM. xviii. 21. "And Saul said to David, thou shalt be my son this day in the twain." Our version hath added (as was indeed necessary) "*in one of the twain.*" The LXX have not this clause, and it seems inconsistent with what follows. What occasion had Saul to employ his servants to insinuate to David his desire of making him his son-in-law, when he had himself just before expressly mentioned, and promised it to David? Have we not some reason to suspect, that the hands which so boldly interpolated the story of David and Goliath have been tampering here too? The 17th, 18th, and 19th verses also are not in the LXX (Vatican,) and seem of the same complexion.

1 SAM. xxv. 6. "Say to him, that liveth (in prosperity)." Heb. לֵחַי, "to him, that liveth;" perhaps an error for תַּחַי, *vivas*, as דָּוִד הַמֶּלֶךְ, *vivat rex*. 1 Sam. x. 24. Then the version will be, "and thus shall ye say, long mayst thou live; peace be both to thee and to thy house," which was the usual address at that time, *vivas et valeas*. The Arabs still retain these salutations, "May God prolong your life,"—"Peace be unto you."

1 SAM. xxviii. 17. "And the Lord hath done to him." Heb. לוֹ. Qu. To whom? Here is an error in the Hebrew text. The LXX have σοι; and several MSS read לָךְ "to thee" instead of לוֹ, which is certainly right, as Saul is the person in question, and the person to whom this is spoken.

2 SAM. i. 18. "He made them also teach the children of Israel (the use of) the bow." Heb. "teach the children of Israel the bow." The word

נִשְׁפָּן



<sup>אֲשֶׁר</sup> here has greatly embarrassed the commentators, nor is it easy to give a clear solution to the difficulty it occasions. Some suppose, that "the bow" was the name by which this song was distinguished, as it was a custom with the Jews to call their songs and hymns by particular names, of which we find examples in the titles of the Psalms. It might be so; yet the name is here introduced so awkwardly, and abruptly, and so confounds the genuine sense, that I am persuaded it was not in the text originally, but afterwards introduced. The LXX read no such word in their copies, and their version is plain and clear, <sup>καὶ ἔτι τὸ δὶδασκαλῆς μου λέγει</sup>. This word then being omitted all will be right, and the version will run, ver. 17, "And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and Jonathan his son." Ver. 18. "And he commanded (it) to be taught" (*i. e.* the lamentation above-mentioned) "to the children of Judah." Meaning, that he ordered it to be made publick, that they might learn it. "Behold it is written in the book of Jasher." Perhaps the Jews might distinguish this song afterwards by the name of <sup>אֲשֶׁר</sup>, from that word occurring in it, ver. 22, or for some other reason; or it might be some musical direction, as Higgsion, Selah, and was at first placed in the margin, (as the place it now occupies does not seem proper for it, even in that view,) and from thence might slide into the text, as many other marginal notes have done. The book of Jasher, in which it was inserted, might be translated, "the authentic register," and was perhaps a collection of historical songs, the usual method at that time of recording national events.

2 SAM. iii. 22. "From (pursuing) a troop." Better perhaps, "from an incursion." LXX EX ΤΗΣ ΕΞΟΔΙΑΣ.

2 SAM.

2 SAM. vi. 2. "From Baale." Instead of "from," the sense requires  $\beta$ , "to Baalah." See 1 Chron. xiii. 6.

2 SAM. vi. 21. "Before the Lord." Some words seem to be dropped in this verse in the Hebrew. The LXX in the beginning read,  $\alpha\rho\chi\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ , "I will dance before Jehovah," and at the close, "yea, I will play, and dance before Jehovah." The sense requires the first.

2 SAM. vii. 16. "And thy house, and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee; thy throne, &c." There is a considerable difference between Samuel and Chronicles in their parallel accounts of this prophecy. In Samuel these words seem to be spoken of David, "thy house, thy kingdom, thy throne." In 1 Chron. xvii. 14. the prophecy relates to the son of David, "I will settle him, in my house, and in my kingdom; and his throne, &c." That this relates to the son of David is most probable from the context, as the prophecy relates not to David himself, but the son of David; and that it was originally "his house, his kingdom, his throne," here, in Samuel, appears from the Gr. version, which has  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon, \kappa\alpha\iota\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon, \kappa\alpha\iota\ \theta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ . Further, instead of "before thee," the Greek has "before me,"  $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\omicron$ , which is undoubtedly right, (so also Syriac, and one MS. reads now  $\text{ܐܠܝ}$ , and *forte* another,) as it certainly refers to God, the speaker here—"before me"—and so David understood it, as appears from verse 29. This verse then in Samuel should run thus—"and his house and his kingdom shall be established for ever before me, and" (the LXX read the  $\gamma$ ) "his throne shall be for ever firm,"—and the reading in Chronicles should be,—  
"settle

"settle him in his house, and in his kingdom, and his throne, &c." The LXX have here *Βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ.*

2 SAM. vii. 28. "And now, O Lord God, thou art that God." This version by no means expresses the true meaning and force of the original; which is, *אתה הוא האלהים*, "thou art He, the God," the God by way of eminence, the true and only God. It might therefore be better expressed perhaps in our idiom, "and thou, O Lord God, art the only God," or, "God alone," *לבר* is often understood, when not written, especially, when there is an emphasis in the expression, as here, *האלהים*. So Ruth i. 17. *המות*, "death alone." The phrase here therefore answers in its true meaning to the parallel one, Is. xxxvii. 16. where *לבר* is expressed, *אתה הוא האלהים לברך*.

2 SAM. viii. 13. "Smiting the Syrians in the valley of salt." *ארים* here should probably be *אדומים*, 1st. Because it is so in the parallel place, 1 Chron. xviii. 12. which agrees with this as to time, place, and numbers slain, but differs in ascribing the victory to Abishai, and not to David; but Abishai might be the general in this battle, acting under the orders of David, and therefore the victory is here ascribed to David. 2dly, The LXX read *ארים*, *Ἰδμεται* here, as well as in Chronicles. 3dly, David's putting garrisons in Edom appears to be the consequence of this victory in Chronicles; therefore it was over the Edomites. 1 Chron. xviii. 13, and ver. 14, of this chapter. Joab's victory over the Edomites in the same valley might be a different action, as the numbers slain differ from the number here; the titles of the psalms however have no sufficient authority. 4thly, One Hebrew MS reads *אדומים*. Another, *nunc* *אדומים*. In the preceding



preceding verse we have also ארם, Syria, where Chron. reads ארם, and the LXX Ἰσχυρίας.

2 SAM. ix. 11. "As for Mephibosheth, (said the king,) he shall eat at my table, as one of the king's sons." There is no "said the king," in the Hebrew, and there was no occasion for the king to say it again, as he had said it already: Indeed, as it now stands in the Hebrew, it is Ziba, who is made to say it. A Hebrew MS has שלחני (instead of שלחני) "his table," and the LXX have, καὶ Μεφ. βοσθηθ. ἐσθ. τὴν τράπεζαν Δαυιδ. The proper version then will be, "And Mephibosheth eat at his (David's) table, as one of the king's sons."

2 SAM. xi. 11. "As thou livest, and as thy soul liveth." So Hebrew. This seems mere tautology. The LXX have not this unnecessary repetition; their version is, πως? ζῇ ἡ ψυχὴ μου, ἢ ποιῶσιν το ἐνμα τετο, where it appears, that for וחי, they read אך, quomodo? which I have no doubt is right. The version then will be, "How, as thy soul liveth, can I do this thing?" In Gen. xxxix. 9. we have the like expression, "How (ואך) can I do this great wickedness?"

2 SAM. xi. 21. This passage leads me to observe a circumstance, which has not been, I think, sufficiently accounted for,—that in the names of persons, of which Baal makes a part, Bosheth is sometimes used instead of it. Thus Jerubbaal, as he is called in Judges, and 1 Sam. xii. 11. is called here Jerubbesheth. Eshbaal and Meribbaal in 1 Chron. viii. 33, 34. are, in 2d. Samuel, Ishbosheth and Mephibosheth. Patrick, on 2 Sam. ii. 8. observes, that Bosheth signifies shame and confusion, and Baal being

being an infamous idol, the Holy Scripture makes these names end promiscuously in Baal, or Bosheth." But I am inclined to think, that the persons in question had not originally two names; that Saul and Jonathan would neither of them call their children by a name of infamy, *i. e.* bosheth; that they were called, but by one name in the original Scripture, *i. e.* Baal; and that the alteration from Baal to Bosheth has been caused by the superstition of the Jews, who substituted the word Bosheth for Baal, when that name became an object of abhorrence among them after the captivity, when they were perfectly cured of idolatry. Perhaps they might be led to this practice, by a too literal interpretation of Hosea ii. 17. and from chap. ix. 10. However let me observe, that in the Greek version of this verse we have Jerubbaal, *Ιερουβαλ*, not Jerubesheth, as in the present Hebrew, which proves that it was not altered in this place in their copies. We have reason to suspect from many instances, besides this, that the Jews were not over-scrupulous about altering their Scriptures on one account or another.

2 SAM. xxi. 8. "Michal." It is with pleasure I see the difficulty, which has so much puzzled commentators in this text, cleared up by two Hebrew MSS. No. 250, reads מרב, and No. 198. מרב; "The five sons of Merab."

1 KINGS i. 48. Hebrew; "who hath given this day one sitting on my throne." Where is certainly an omission. David surely meant one of his own offspring according to the promise of God to him. The Lxx have *ἐκ τῆς σπέρματος μου*, "one of my seed;"

U u

and

and one Hebrew MS has the word בְּנִי, "my son," after הָיָה.

1 KINGS xi. 33. "Because they have forsaken me, &c." עֲזָבוּנִי, Hebrew. The Greek version hath the verbs in the singular number, and rightly. 1st. Because Solomon is the person spoken of as the subject of the message, in the preceding and following verses; and 2dly, The Hebrew betrays its own error in the close, by the words כְּדָוִד אָבִי, "as David his father," which appropriates what is here said to Solomon. As it stands in the present Hebrew text it is not sense. Five Hebrew MSS have the first verb singular, עֲזָבָה; and six, וַיִּשְׁתָּחוּ.

1 KINGS xii. 2. "When Jeroboam, who was yet in Egypt, heard of it—" What then? We are not told. But the omission may be supplied from the parallel place, 2 Chron. x. 2. which adds, "that Jeroboam returned out of Egypt." Perhaps however here is no omission, but rather an error in the text, i. e. of בְּמִצְרַיִם, for מִמִּצְרַיִם, as it is in Chron. The difference between Kings and Chron. in the word וַיִּשָּׁב, is only in the points, which are of no authority. Then the passage will run the same as in Chron. and the version the same, "It came to pass, when Jeroboam—heard of it—that he returned out of Egypt." The LXX have not this verse, and differ greatly from the Hebrew in this and in the foregoing chapter.

1 KINGS xii. 20. "When all Israel heard, that Jeroboam was come again, they sent, and called him, &c." This seems inconsistent with what is said verse 3, and 12. above, that Jeroboam appeared in person at the head of the people in their address to Rehoboam.



Rehoboam. If so, they must not only have heard, but seen, that he was returned. The parallel place, 2 Chron. chap. x. hath not this verse, and the narration is there consistent. The LXX have this verse; but as it mentions nothing of Jeroboam's appearing at the head of the congregation after his return, but seems to suppose him concealed, its narration also is consistent. And I confess it doth not seem so likely, that such an obnoxious person as Jeroboam should head the people on a petition for redress of grievances; this would have been too affronting, and a seeming insult on the king; but rather more probable that he should lie awhile concealed, perhaps plotting, and intriguing, and in readiness to take advantage of circumstances.

1 KINGS xii. 32, 33. "And Jeroboam ordained a feast in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month, like unto the feast that is in Judah, and he offered upon the altar (so did he in Bethel) sacrificing to the calves, that he had made, and he placed in Bethel the priests of the high places, which he had made. Verse 33. So he offered upon the altar, he had made in Bethel, in the fifteenth day of the eighth month," &c. We have here an account of Jeroboam's instituting a feast, in honour of his new gods, which he set up at Dan, and at Bethel, in imitation of the feast of tabernacles at Jerusalem, and by the clause, "so did he in Bethel," it should seem that he celebrated it first at Dan, and afterwards at Bethel with the same rites as he did at Dan, and so the commentators I have consulted understand it. Patrick, on the clause, "so did he in Bethel," thus comments, "what he had done in Dan, he did also in Bethel, for hitherto hath been related only what he did in the remotest place."

See also his comment on the latter part of the 33d verse. Now here it may be objected, 1st, That it is not reasonable to suppose, that Jeroboam would institute his new feast, and celebrate it first at Dan, the remotest corner of the kingdom, but at Bethel, near his own royal residence, which appears by the tenor of the future history to have been the capital seat of idolatry, the rival of the temple at Jerusalem, "the king's sanctuary, and the king's court," as it is called, Amos vii. 13. 2dly, That, this clause excepted, there is the greatest reason to conclude from the tenor of the narration, that the whole transaction was performed at one time, and at one place, and that at Bethel. 3dly, By supposing that he celebrated it first at Dan, and then at Bethel, so as he did at Dan, a plain absurdity follows, *i. e.* that he celebrated the same feast both at Dan, and at Bethel, the same day of the same month; for it was the fifteenth day of the eighth month that he celebrated the feast; but the distance of the places, together with the time the celebration of such a solemn feast would necessarily take up, renders the very supposition of such a thing absurd. These difficulties occurred to me in reading this passage. I then looked into the Greek version, and all these difficulties vanished: all was plain and consistent; and that only by a different reading of one word in the text; for instead of "so, כן, did he at Bethel," it has ο επωινσεν εν Βεθλθα; he offered upon the altar, which he had made at Bethel; reading either, אשר, (and one MS has now אשר, as in verse 33.) or, כי, which more nearly resembles כן, the word now in the Hebrew text, which is often used in the relative sense of אשר. (See many instances of this in the note on Jer. vii. 21, 22.) Here then we find, that Jeroboam celebrated this new feast, not at Dan first, and

and afterwards at Bethel on the same day, but at Bethel, "he offered on the altar, which he had made at Bethel, sacrificing to the calves he had made, and he placed at Bethel the priests, &c." The whole translation relates to Bethel only, and the difficulties that occur in the Hebrew text in this place are removed. If it be objected, that the 33d verse will be an unnecessary repetition; I answer, that repetitions, like this, are very common in the stile of the Old Testament. But this recapitulation will appear more proper here, when it is considered, that this verse is connected with the following, verse 1. of chap. xiii. and should not have been separated from it. It is the introduction to another narration, and another subject, concerning the people, &c. and should have begun the next chapter, not ended this. And in this view our version of the beginning of this 33d verse is very proper, "So he offered, (I often carries this sense,) upon the altar he had made at Bethel, in the fifteenth day of the eighth month, and ordained a feast, and offered upon the altar, and burnt incense. And behold there came a man of God," *i. e.* while, or, as he was doing this, a man of God came. This 33d verse, then is designed to introduce the ensuing story, and therefore not an unnecessary repetition. But further, this verse explains the former, as it fixes the transaction to one day, as well as the former, and consequently to one place, and that Bethel expressly; and therefore it was but one transaction, and the same as that spoken of in the 32d verse.

1 KINGS xv. 5. "Save only in the matter of Uriah." I much suspect this clause to be an interpolation. 1st, Because the Greek version hath not this saving clause. 2dly, Because it is contrary to fact.

The



The first part of the verse, that "David did what was right in the eyes of Jehovah, and turned not aside from any thing that he commanded him," is most probably genuine, and is true with respect to the public character of David, as a king, and his administration of the laws and statutes of Jehovah relating to the church and state of the Jews, to which alone, I apprehend, what is here said of him refers; and herein he was the man of God's own heart, who fulfilled all his will in this respect in opposition to Saul, who made no scruple to deviate from it. But this has nothing to do with his private character. Some injudicious person however, not perceiving this, and taking it to include his private character too, in order to save the credit of the sacred historian, might, I suppose, put this clause into the margin, "save only in the matter of Uriah," which relates to his character as a moral man; but in this respect the observation is unhappily not true, for David was guilty of several, and some very great breaches of God's moral law, besides the matter of Uriah. From the margin it might be taken into the text, as many other passages have been.

1 KINGS xv. 6. This verse also looks like an interpolation; nor is it acknowledged by the LXX. The history of Rehoboam was closed in the former chapter, and there it is said, "there was war between him, and Jeroboam all their days." Then follows the history of his son Abijam, and in the midst of it this passage comes in again, where it can have no business.

1 KINGS xx. 38. 41. Verse 38. "Disguised himself with ashes on his face." Verse 41. "Took the ashes away." Here seems to be an error in the Hebrew

Hebrew text. I should rather suppose a veil, or some other kind of covering to be meant. The Targum and Jewish critics understood the word here used to signify *Velamen*. Buxt. in verbo אפר. Probably then they did not read אפר, nor the LXX, whose version is *τελαμῶν*, *fascia, vitta*. I suspect therefore, that אפר is a mistake for אפר, *amicus*, from אפר, *amicivit, cinxit*. A Hebrew MS, N<sup>o</sup>. 99. read אפר, in the 41st verse, which is probably the true reading. א and א are frequently interchanged. The proper version then may be, "He disguised himself with a veil," or "Garment on his face,"—"he took the veil away."

1 KINGS xxii. 13. The Hebrew strictly rendered is, "Lo! the words of the prophets with one mouth good unto the king." Our translators supply, declare. Probably דברי should be דברי, "Lo! the prophets with one mouth speak good unto the king." So read the LXX, ἀγαθὰς παρὸς τοὺς προφῆτας. In 2 Chron. xviii. 12. also, דברי, should be דברי; LXX there, ἐλαλῶσι.

2 KINGS i. 10. 12. "Let fire come down." Perhaps better; "Fire will come down," as a prediction of the testimony God would bear to his prophet, rather than as a prayer of Elijah, asking fire from heaven, which favours too much of a cruel spirit, and is not becoming so holy a prophet. LXX, καταβήσεται—"will come down."

2 KINGS vi. 33. "And while he yet talked with them, behold the messenger came down unto him, and he said, Behold, this evil is of the Lord, what should I wait for the Lord any longer?" Our translation seems to represent the prophet as saying this, and so common readers, I believe, generally understand

understand it; but surely, it was a strange thing for so holy a prophet to say. The common interpretation seems to be, that the messenger said this in the name of his master; but it seems much more likely, that the king himself should say it. The king followed the messenger immediately; and when the messenger came to the door, the sound of the king's feet was behind him, verse 32. The messenger was detained at the door, therefore the king came as soon as he within the house. Nor is it probable that the messenger should say this in his master's name, because we do not find, that any such words were commanded him to say, and because he was sent for a very different purpose, to cut off the prophet's head, verse 31, 32. That the king should say these words in person, is very agreeable to the circumstances of distress, and despair, he was then in, but not so likely he should send them by a messenger. And that the king was now really in the presence of Elisha appears from the 2d, 17th and 18th verses of the 7th chapter, where we find, that he spake to the king there in person. I think then that there is reason to suspect an error in the text, and that המלאך, the messenger, is written by mistake for המלך, the king. Then all would be consistent and clear; the only difference is the improper insertion of the א, which was an easy mistake; especially as המלאך occurs in the verse before: this, with the likeness of the words, renders an error of the transcriber the more probable. מלאכי is written for מלכי, in 2 Sam. xi. 1. by a like error. The version will be, "And while he yet talked with them the king came down, and said, Behold this evil, &c." to which Elisha replies in the two first verses of the following chapter, directing his answer to the king, and he was answered by a lord, on whose



whose hand the king leaned; therefore the king was there in person. These two verses then should not have been divided from, but have ended the 6th chapter.

2 Kings vii. 13. On this verse I would make the following remarks :

1st. There are seven words repeated here by mistake, which, as Dr. Kennicott observes in his Diff. Gen. Sect. 89, are not in seventy-six Hebrew MSS; and, these seven words omitted, the version will be as follows. " And one of the servants answered and said, let them take, I pray thee, five of the horses that remain, which are left in it; behold they are, as all the multitude of Israel, that are consumed." Still however of this I can make no sense. It may be asked, What are as all the multitude of Israel, that are consumed? The five horses, that were to be sent? or, all the horses, that remained? or how any horses that remained were like a multitude, that was consumed? Here seems no meaning; at least one difficult to find out: Some other correction therefore seems necessary.

2dly. It is said, " let them take five of the horses, that remain." We are not told however, how many horses did remain, which yet seems intended. One MS hath אחד, instead of חמשה; another had אחד חמשה; another hath אחד אחד primò; another hath אחד חמשה.

3dly. Instead of בכל many MSS read בל, " in," or, " of," which may give a better sense. Vulgate, " in universa." LXX have παντα; they did not then read בכל, but might read בל, as well as the Vulgate.

4thly. הן is a particle of attention, or confirmation, and may be sometimes translated,

X x

" even,

"even, indeed, surely," so Gen. vi. 7. ואני הנני, "I, even I."

With the help of these corrections the verse might be thus arranged. ויקחו נא אחד מן חמשה חסוסים הנשארים אשר נשארו בה הנם בכל המון ישראל אשר תמו "Let them take, I pray thee, one of the five remaining horses, that are left in it," (בה, perhaps "the city;" לxxv), "even they *alone* (i. e. are left) out of all the multitude of Israel, that are consumed." ב often signifies, "of, out of," 1 Sam. xi. 11. "so that two together were not left of, or, out of them, (ונשארו בם). 2 Sam. ii. 31. "of Benjamin and Abner's men, (ובאנשי אבנר). — Or, as הנם may be here transferred from its usual place, for the sake of greater emphasis, the version might run more naturally in our idiom thus—"Let them take, I pray thee, the five remaining horses; lo! they (only) are what are left in it, out of all the multitude of Israel, that are consumed." N. B. לכו, "alone, only," is many times implied, where it is not expressed, as Ezekiel xiv. 14, 20. compared with verses 16, 18, especially when there is an emphasis in the expression, as here, "lo! or, even, they only;" and Ruth. i. 17. המות. "Death alone." Whether any thing here offered may tend to clear this obscure passage, I presume not to determine.

2 Kings ix. 27. The literal version of the Hebrew here is, "smite him also in the chariot at the going up to Gur;" but we have no account of the execution of these orders, "and they did so" being the insertion of our translators, who were sensible of something defective or corrupted; and probably, there is an error, which the Lxx may help us to correct

correct, whose version is, *καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ στα-  
ταξεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὴν ἀμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν ἀνακαίνισιν αὐτοῦ.* For הכחו,  
we should probably read ויכחו, or, ויכוהו, and the  
version will be, “and Jehu followed after him,  
and said, Him also, (וְגַם אֹתוֹ) a short way of expres-  
sion, and very natural in the hurry of a pursuit,  
*καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν*) and he, or, they smote him in his  
chariot in the way to Gur.”

2 Kings x. 24. “If any of the men, whom I  
have brought into your hands escape, (he that letteth  
him go) his life shall answer for his life.” Our  
translators have taken great liberties with this pas-  
sage to make it sense. In the Masoretic text it is  
indeed nonsense. “The man that shall escape of  
the men, whom I have brought into your hands,  
his life shall answer for his life,” *i. e.* his life shall  
answer for his own life. But if we pay no atten-  
tion to the points ימלט (which is pointed in niphel)  
may be taken actively, and then a clear and con-  
sistent sense will follow. “And he said, that man,  
(הַאִישׁ) who shall suffer to escape any of the men,  
whom I have brought into your hands, his life shall  
answer for the life of him,” *i. e.* for the life of him,  
whom he suffers to escape.

2 Kings xvii. 27. “And let them go, and dwell  
there, and let him teach.” The plural seems writ  
here for the singular, “let him go” “let him  
teach,” as it refers but to one priest, and it appears  
from the following verse, that but one was sent.

2 Kings xvii. 33. “Whom they carried away  
from thence.” This is quite unintelligible. Nor  
does the margin mend the matter, “who carried  
them away from thence;” for they were not carried



away from thence by the Assyrians, but brought thither. The sense and context will oblige us to read **שׁוּ** or **שׁוּמָה**, for **שׁוּמָה**. As the preceding word ends with **ו**, it might be easily repeated by mistake before the finals were in use. One MS has now **שׁוּ**. Then the version will be, "of the nations, who brought them thither."

2 KINGS xvii. 34. "They fear not the Lord, neither do they after their statutes, or after their ordinances, or after the law, and commandment, which the Lord commanded the children of Jacob, &c." This passage in the Hebrew is much confused, and inconsistent with what is said in the context. It is difficult to comprehend, what is meant by, "their statutes," and, "their ordinances." If it means, that they did not after their *own idolatrous* statutes, and ordinances, that would be a flat contradiction to the assertions of the 33d and 41st verses. Probably then the words **חֻקֵּיהֶם**, and **מִצְוֹתֵיהֶם** were originally **חֻקֵּיהֶם** and **מִצְוֹתֵיהֶם**, as in the 37th verse, where the same things are repeated in the same order. One Hebrew MS had **מִצְוֹתֵיהֶם** *primò*; another hath **חֻקֵּיהֶם**, intended likely for **חֻקֵּיהֶם**, as the Jewish transcribers often omitted the **ו**, and signified it by a dash, as **שׁוּ**, which dash being neglected in future transcriptions the **ו** was totally dropped. The omission, or change of a letter here, will appear less unlikely, when we observe, that in the 31st verse a letter is omitted in each of the two last words, the (י) in **אֱלֹהֵי**, and the (ו) in **שְׁפָרִים**, written **אֱלֹהֵי**, and **שְׁפָרִים**, and **שְׁפָרִים**, and **שְׁפָרִים**. Many MSS have these two words regular. With these corrections the sense will be; "To this day they are doing after their former customs: They are not fearing Jehovah, nor doing after the statutes, nor after the ordinances, nor after the

the law, and commandment, which Jehovah commanded the children of Jacob;” Still however, all seems not to be right. “They are not fearing Jehovah,” is inconsistent with verses 32, 33, and 41, where we find they worshipped Jehovah, but in conjunction with their own false gods, and with idolatrous rites. But the LXX have not the negative, and, that omitted, the whole passage will be in exact agreement with the context. “They are fearing Jehovah, but not doing after the statutes, and after the ordinances, &c.”

2 KINGS xviii. 2. “Twenty-five years old was he (Hezekiah) when he began to reign.” So Hebrew. Ahaz his father was but thirty-six years old, when he died, chap. xvi. ver. 2. He must therefore have begot Hezekiah when he was but about eleven years old; but this is scarcely supposable. Instances of this kind have been indeed alledged by commentators, but it would be better, I think, to allow an error somewhere in the numbers; and it appears to me, that there is one in the account we have of the age of his father, Ahaz, when he began to reign, chap. xvi. ver. 2. He is said there to be twenty years old; so also it is said in the parallel place, 2 Chron. xxviii. 1. The LXX here in Kings have also twenty; but in 2 Chron. xxviii. 1, the LXX have *ἡλικίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἔτη, 25*, which is probably right. According to this account then, Ahaz was forty-one, when he died, and might be sixteen, when Hezekiah was born, or more, as the scripture-historians frequently pass over the odd months in the reckoning, but express themselves in round numbers. This will reduce the matter to probability. Likely the royal family of Judah might marry very young; the father of Ahaz, Jotham, begat him  
nearly

nearly at the same age, supposing that Ahaz was twenty-five, when he began to reign, for he (Jotham) also died at the age of forty-one.

2 KINGS xxiii. 13. "Mount of corruption." Hebrew *הר המשחת*. The mount of olives, so called on account of this profanation, by a little change of the letters from *המשחה*. But it may be queried, whether it stood so originally, or was altered afterwards for the sake of the allusion, as the Chaldee reads *מור זיתא*, *mons olivarum*, and a Hebrew MS. reads *הר המשחה*, "the mount of olives." This, among many other instances, affords a suspicion of wilful corruption.

1 CHRONICLES xx. 3. "And he brought out the people, and cut them with saws, and with harrows of iron, and with axes, &c." In the transaction mentioned here, and in 2 Samuel xii. 31. David is made guilty of more than barbarian cruelty, not only putting his captived enemies to death, but inflicting on them the most shocking, and lingering tortures; but, I believe, without a proper foundation. The parallel passage, 2 Samuel xii. 31. may be more properly translated in a milder sense, "And he brought forth the people, that were therein, and put them to the saw, and to iron harrows, and axes of iron, and made them to pass to, or, removed them to the brick-kiln, i. e. put them to these servile employments, and reduced them to a state of slavery. Nearly thus, if I remember right, Dr. Chandler translates it in his Life of David. *ב* is properly rendered "to" in this place. See Nehemiah, iii. 5. But the nobles put not their hands to the work, (*בעבירה*)." But the chief difficulty lies in this passage, which, as it now stands in the Hebrew text, seems



seems not capable of bearing this milder sense: a difficulty however, which, I think, may be easily removed. Any person who compares this verse with its parallel one in 2 Samuel xii. 31, will easily discern, that the former was taken from the latter: and there is great reason to believe, that the former was taken from the latter originally word for word; at least with no material variation.

Sam. ואת העם אשר בה הוציא וישם במגרה ובחרצי הברזל

Chron. ואת העם אשר בה הוציא וישר במגרה ובחרצי הברזל

Sam. ובמגורות הברזל והעביר אותם במלכן וכן יעשה \*

Chron. ובמגדות \* \* \* \* \* וכן יעשה דויד

Sam. לכל ערי בני עמון וישב דויד וכל העם ירושלם :

Chron. לכל ערי בני עמון וישב דויד וכל העם ירושלם :

From this comparison it appears, that a clause in Samuel is omitted in Chronicles, and the second הברזל; and that Chronicles has the additional word דויד, which is not in Samuel; but in all other respects the two texts agree with each other, word for word, except in the two following instances, that in Chronicles we have וישר, instead of וישם, as in Samuel; and ובמגרות instead of ובמגורות, as in Samuel. Now this latter in Chronicles is plainly a blunder, caused by dropping one letter (ו), because מנקה, “the saw,” had been mentioned already, and the true rendering of the Hebrew words, as they now stand, is, “and he cut them with the saw, and with harrows of iron, and with saws”—which is an absurd tautology. No doubt then but the word was originally the same here, as in Samuel. Is there not then the greatest reason to conclude that the word וישר was also originally וישם, as in Samuel? For my own part I am fully satisfied of it. The alteration might easily happen, if we suppose the farther side, and bottom of the □ to be obliterated

obliterated in any copy, the remainder would appear as a 7. On this supposition the text in Chronicles would be the same as in Samuel; and therefore capable of the same milder sense, that David made them slaves, as was in those times the usual manner of treating captives in war.

1 CHRON. xxvii. 18. "Elihu, one of the brethren of David, should be *Eliab*. LXX Ελιαβ.

2 CHRONICLES i. 13. "To the high place." So Hebrew. The sense however requires "from" פָּנֵה. So LXX, αὐτοῦ. Our translators oddly supply, "from his journey."

2 CHRON. iii. 10. "Image-work." Margin, moveable work. Heb. מַעֲשֵׂה. This word is nowhere else to be met with, and has puzzled the critics exceedingly. In the parallel place, 1 Kings vi. 23. we are told that the cherubim were made of עֵץ זַיְתֹּן, "olive-wood;" and it is not improbable, but that the original reading here too was עֵץ, from the transposition and repetition of which letters this strange word might be formed. Then both accounts will agree in informing us, that the cherubim were made of "wood." This conjecture seems confirmed by the LXX, who read εἰκὼν here in their copy; εἰκὼν ἐκ ξύλου.

2 CHRON. iv. 16. "Did Hiram his father make to king Solomon"—Heb. אָבִי. Which is manifestly absurd. Commentators have tortured their wits here, to account for what is after all a plain blunder of transcribers. The LXX did not read אָבִי; but some word of which ἱερατικός was the version, probably, ἱερατικός. And then the sense will be clear and proper.

proper. "And all their instruments did Hiram make, and bring to king Solomon." If the word was originally *יביא*, it might by an erroneous transposition of the letters become, *איבי*, and a future transcriber, supposing it meant, *אבי*, "his father," and was wrongly spelt, might drop the first (י). Many instances of such transpositions we meet with in the Hebrew Text, and in the MSS sometimes, with a little change of the letters, sometimes without; as, *חסרה*, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 22. is in 2 Kings xxii. 14. *חרחם*: *רחם*, Nehemia xii. 3, is, in verse 15, *חרים*. &c. &c.

The LXX then we see will clear up a passage, to explain which commentators have tortured themselves much to little purpose. Some have supposed that Hiram here is called Solomon's father, from the respect Solomon had for him. Others, that "Huran his father," is put for "Hiram and his father," by an ellipsis; a most curious criticism! But, as it happened, his father was then dead. 1 Kings vii. 14. Others suppose, that Hiram's name was, "Hiram Abif," called in chap. ii. 13. "Hiram Abi," whom Patrick follows; but Abif and Abi are two different names, and the sense of chap. ii. 13. is, "I have sent a skilful man of Hiram my father." *i. e.* belonging to Hiram my father, as our translators understand it. King Hiram, his father, and this workman were of the same name; a thing not improbable.

2 CHRON. v. 13. The Hebrew runs thus, "the house was filled with a cloud, the house of the Lord." The repetition of "the house" here seems unnecessary. The LXX read *כבוד*, instead of the latter *בית*, "the house was filled with the cloud of the glory of Jehovah."—"The glory of Jehovah," is

Y y

the



the phrase in the other passages relating to this subject.

2 CHRON. xii. 1. "all Israel with him—" The Masorets say, there are six places where Israel is put for Judah; this appears to be one of them. See 1 Kings xiv. 22—24. The 6th verse below is likely another, where one MS reads Judah. As also 2 Chron. xxi. 2. "Jehosaphat King of Israel." Where the LXX, Syriac, Arabic and Vulgate read Judah, and many MSS. and chap. xxviii. 9. "Ahaz King of Israel;" where the LXX and Vulgate read Judah, and many MSS.

2 CHRON. xvii. 3. "In the first ways of David his father." So Hebrew. In 1 Kings xxii. 43. it is, "in all the ways of Aza his father." The LXX here in Chronicles have not David, but only, "in the first ways of his father," i. e. Aza. In this same book, chap. xx. ver. 32. it is, "Aza his father," and so LXX there. David is then a mistake for Aza, and should be corrected.

2 CHRON. xx. 34. "Jehu the son of Hanani, who is mentioned, &c." I should rather translate, "Behold! they are written in the book, or narrative, of Jehu the son of Hanani, which he put in the book of the kings of Israel." It appears to me most likely that Jehu being a prophet, at that time, had a hand in composing the history of the kings, as Iddo, Nathan, and others of the prophets. The LXX favour this interpretation by translating העלה actively, καταρξασι, and Vulgate *con-*  
*gessit.*

2 CHRON. xxi. 7. "The Lord would not destroy the house of David." This passage may correct 2 Kings viii. 19. where it is, "not destroy Judah." I should prefer the reading of Chronicles, for the corruption of the house of David alone does not seem a reason, why God should destroy the whole kingdom of Judah, but it might be a good reason for rejecting the house of David; and the promise referred to related to the succession of *his* family to the throne, in particular, and not to Judah in general, בית דוד may have been altered into את יהודה.

2 CHRON. xxi, 12. "Came a writing to him from Elijah the prophet." It is certain, that Elijah the great prophet was now dead; nor do we read of any other Elijah the prophet. The Jews account for this in their usual manner, by making strange suppositions; but the most probable supposition to me is, that, אליהו, is here written by mistake for אלישע, (Elijah for Elisha,) a transcriber having written אלי, the first part of Elisha, casts his eye on the resembling word אלי, just before, and adds the ו, which makes it אליו. Another transcriber coming after him, supposing Elijah to be intended, and therefore that the name was wrongly spelt, adds the ה, and so it becomes אליהו. This is at least more credible, than that Elijah should send the writing from heaven, as the Jewish Rabbis would have it.

2 CHRON. xxiv. 25. "The blood of the sons of Jehoiada." So Hebrew. We read before but of one son of Jehoiada, that was slain by Joash, i. e. Zechariah. The LXX read the word singular, υιου, and their reading is probably right, בן, not בני.

2 CHRON. xxiv. 26. "Zabad," Hebrew זָבָד; but in 2 Kings xii. 21. we are told his name was Jo-zachar. The man however had probably but one name originally in both places, whatever that name might be. The similarity of the letters ז and כ, and ב, will account for the error in the last syllable; and with respect to the first syllable ז, Jo, that might be easily dropt here in Chronicles, as the very same letters end the preceding word עָלָיו, so that his name was most likely, יִזְכָּר, as in Kings.

2 CHRON. xxv. 6. "He hired also a 100,000 mighty men of valour out of Israel." It has been justly observed, that it does not seem probable, that the Israelites could afford to lend so many troops to a neighbouring prince, considering the small number, to which their armies were reduced a few years before by the king of Assyria, 2 Kings xiii. 7. Here then likely is an error in the numbers, and the point is to account for it. Now the difference between כ, a 100, and כ', 20, is so small in pronunciation, as might easily occasion a mistake, especially if one read, while another wrote, which might be sometimes the case. Were we then to suppose, כ, 100,000, to be writ for כ', 20,000, the number would be brought to a probability. This conjecture may be further strengthened by considering the smallness of the sum, a 100 talents of silver, which seems more adequate to 20,000, than to an 100,000 soldiers.

2 CHRON. xxv. 13. "Fell upon the cities of Judah—and smote 3000 of them." It should be, "and smote 3000 (persons) out of them." Hebrew כָּדָם.

2 CHRON:



2 CHRON. xxv. 20. "Into the hand (of their enemies.)" Hebrew בִּיד, "into the hand." Perhaps, בְּיָדוֹ, "into his hand," i. e. of Joash, which the sense seems to require.

2 CHRON. xxvi. 8. "And the Ammonites gave gifts." So Hebrew, הַמְּעֻנִים. I suspect that this word should have been הַמְּחֻנִים, the same as what ended the former verse; the error is only a transposition of two letters. The LXX read הַמְּחֻנִים in both places, *Mivunus, Mivunoi*, and the former verse gives us an account of the war of Uzziah against the nations in the southern part only. The Mehunnim, or Maonites, are there mentioned, as one of them, being a people of Arabia to the south of Judah; and this passage seems to inform us, not only that he overcame them, but also brought them under tribute. Whereas the Ammonites are not mentioned before, nor were they one of these southern nations, which seem to have been concerned in the war here related, but were situated towards the north of Judah.

2 CHRON. xxviii. 10. "Are there not (with) you, (even) with you"—Heb. הֲלֹא רַק אַתֶּם עִמָּכֶם אֲשָׁמוֹת. The word אַתֶּם here much embarrasses the sense, which literally is, "are there not you, with you sins, &c." Perhaps it may have been inserted by mistake from the line above, by a transcriber's casting his eye upon it carelessly; and, it being omitted, the sense will be clear. "Are there not truly with you transgressions against Jehovah, your God?" רק, sometimes signifies, *certè*, "surely, truly, indeed," Deut. iv. 6. "surely," Judges xiv. 16. "thou dost surely hate me," Prov. xiii. 10. "surely by pride cometh contention."

2 CHRON. XXIX. 19. "The vessels, which Ahaz did cast away." Hebrew מְמִינִים. The LXX translate the word *μιασμεν*, "polluted, or, profaned." They probably read מְמִינִים, "defiled," i. e. by applying them to the use of his idols, and thus committed spiritual whoredom with them, which rendered it necessary, that they should be again sanctified, as it follows in the context. Thus the same verb is used chapter xxi. 11. "caused the inhabitants of Jerusalem to commit fornication," Hebrew מְמִינִים, i. e. caused them to commit idolatry, and verse 13, מְמִינִים מְמִינִים, is therefore in all probability the true reading; for it is not so likely, that he would cast them away; (they were too precious;) but use them in his idolatrous worship, just as he profaned the house of God itself, by the introduction of idolatrous practices.

2 CHRON. XXXVI. 10. "Zedekiah his brother," Hebrew מְמִינִים, an undoubted error, as he was his uncle, his father's brother, vide 2 Kings xxiv. 17. מְמִינִים, Jer. xxxvii. 1. The LXX have here, *αδελφός τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ*. It might then stand originally, מְמִינִים אָבִי, and the two letters, מְ, may have been dropped, by mistake on account of their similarity to the preceding מְמִינִים.

2 CHRON. XXXVI. 21. From this verse it appears, that the Jews had neglected 70 sabbatical years, which might happen in a period of about 500 years, which period reckoned from Jehoiakim's captivity will carry us up to the administration of Samuel, for the commencement of this neglect, where some indeed place it. But to me it appears very improbable, that such a violation of an express law of God should commence under the administration of  
fo

so holy a prophet, and so strict an observer of the divine law, who would surely have exerted all his authority and influence to prevent it. Nor can I think that David, so zealous for the honour of God's institutions, would have suffered it to be neglected in his reign. We are told, that he was "the man after God's own heart, who fulfilled all his will," which, I apprehend, refers to his public character, as a king, in the strict observance of all the rites and institutions of divine appointment, as to himself, and supporting their observation among his people, in opposition to Saul, who in this respect was guilty of neglect and disobedience; and on this account he and his family were rejected from the kingdom, and David anointed in their room. Now had David permitted such a breach of the divine law during his reign, it could by no means be said that he fulfilled *all* the will of God. Nor can I suppose, that Solomon would have suffered such a neglect in the good part of his reign. I am inclined to think, that it began long before the period mentioned above, *i. e.* the time of Samuel. It is most natural to suppose, that a breach of a divine institution of so extraordinary a nature should commence in a time of great degeneracy, and idolatry. Now we find, that the Israelites soon after the death of Joshua fell into idolatry, and continued much addicted to it down to the days of Samuel. As soon then as the worship of the true God began to be neglected, and his institutions in *other* respects broken, a negligence in this instance might commence among others, and most probably did so, 'till its observation was entirely suspended, and so continued, while their degeneracy, and defection from the true God lasted. It might revive again in the days of some of the pious judges and kings, as Samuel, David, &c. but during the  
long



long and idolatrous reign of Manasseh it might cease entirely, and be never more revived; unless perhaps for a time in the reign of Josiah. It seems to me therefore most probable, that the neglect of this institution is not to be reckoned from any period in a continued succession, but that it took place by intervals. The Sabbatical year was observed, or neglected, according to the different religious state of things, which from time to time prevailed; and the pious, or idolatrous disposition of the kings, who reigned; and it had been so often neglected, as to make up the number of 70 sabbatical years, of which the land had been deprived, and which it was therefore now to enjoy.

Dr. Prideaux indeed supposes only fifty-two years of desolation, *i. e.* from the death of Gedaliah, to fulfil fifty-two sabbatical years, which had been neglected. The period then would amount only to 364 years of non-observation in a continued succession, which he supposes to commence in the beginning of the reign of Asa. Prid. Con. Vol. I. p. 194. But to this it may be objected, 1<sup>st</sup>. That it is not probable that this neglect should *begin* in the reign of Asa, who "did, what was good and right in the eyes of Jehovah, his God, and commanded Judah to seek Jehovah, the God of their fathers, and to do the law, and the commandment," 2 Chron. xiv. 2, 5. 2<sup>dly</sup>. This text says expressly, that the land lay desolate and kept sabbath to fulfil threescore and ten years, *i. e.* 'till she had enjoyed her sabbaths, so many of which therefore had been neglected. The desolation of the land might be reckoned from its commencement at the first captivity, though not compleat, 'till the death of Gedaliah, as the seventy years captivity itself is reckoned from that of Jehoiakim,

hoiakim, as that was the beginning of the calamity, though but few were carried away at that time.

NEHEMIAH IV. 12. "And it came to pass, that when the Jews, that dwelt by them, came, they said unto us ten times, from all places whence ye shall return to us." So far the Hebrew, which has no meaning. Our translators to make some sense out of it have added, "they will be upon you," of which there is no trace in the Hebrew. Perhaps there are more errors than one in the text. If instead of תשובו, we were to read, ישובו, a clearer meaning would follow, as to the first part of the clause. The Samaritans, Arabians, Ammonites and Ashdodites, (as we read in the 7th and subsequent verses), who dwelt in places distant from each other, conspired together, and formed a league, to prevent the building of the walls by force, and to fight against Jerusalem. This intelligence was brought to the Jews at Jerusalem, by the Jews who inhabited the countries near to these nations, "who said unto them repeatedly," "from all places, where they dwell," (ישובו) (they will be) "upon us." Still however the words, "they will be," are supplied, and some verb is necessary. Here the LXX will assist us, whose version is, ἀπὸ πανταχοῦ ἐκ ταύτων τῶν τόπων ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, "from all places they will advance against us," ἐκ ταύτων τῶν τόπων being equivalent to "all places, where they dwell;" and by the word ἀπὸ πανταχοῦ the Greek translators appear to have read a verb, before עלינו, probably יעלו. The similarity of these two words might occasion the omission of one of them. The Hebrew then might run originally in this manner, מכל המקומות אשר ישובו יעלו עלינו. "From all places where they dwell, they will advance against us." The Syriac seems to have read ישובו,

and its version is agreeable in sense to the LXX. "*Venerunt* (perhaps, *venient*) *ad pugnandum contra vos, ex omnibus, quibus debebant.*" Its *degebant* answers to שבו, and its *venient ad pugnandum* is equivalent to, עלו, and to the LXX's ἀναγαγόντων. It is probable therefore that the author of this translation also read עלו.

NEHEMIAH iv. 23. "None of us put off our clothes, (saving that) every one put them off (for) washing." I doubt this version. "Saving that," and, "for," are not in the Hebrew, which indeed gives no sense. The marginal version seems better, "Every one (went with) his weapon (for) water." שלו (from שלח, *misit*) signifies, "a javelin, or, missile weapon," and so signifies ver. 17 above. One MS, for חמיו, reads במי, which may be rendered, "for water." I have some suspicion however, that for חמיו, or במי, we should read בימן. "Every man his weapon in his right hand;" "Every man sword in hand," as we should say.

NEHEMIAH vi. 19. "Also they reported his good deeds before me, and uttered my words to him." The LXX, instead of שובתי, seem to have read דבריו, τὰς λέξεις αὐτῶν. Then the version will be, "Moreover his words they reported before me, and my words they carried to him;" which seems preferable, one part of the sentence being probably designed to answer to the other, and both referring to the letters above-mentioned between Tobiah and the nobles, who informed Nehemiah of what Tobiah said, and what Nehemiah said was by these means carried to Tobiah.

ESTHER



ESTHER i. 18. Hebrew; "And this day will the ladies of Persia, and Media, who have heard of the transaction of the queen, say to all the princes of the king." So the Hebrew literally. But what were they to say? We are not told, the sense is left abrupt, and imperfect, and then follows a clause, literally translated, "and as too much of contempt and wrath." The passage, as it now stands, appears scarcely intelligible. Our translators endeavour to patch it, as well as they can, but not very successfully. But if instead of כרי, we were to read ברי, and omit the (ו) before that word, (כ and ב are often writ one for the other, and the ו inserted or omitted improperly), and thus make the two clauses one sentence, this small alteration might probably restore its genuine meaning. "And from this day, or, from henceforth, (as היום often signifies) will the ladies of Persia, and Media, who have heard of the transaction of the queen, speak to the princes of the king," (i. e. their husbands) "with too much contempt and heat, or, petulance," as the word seems here to mean. Or if we retain the (ו) before ברי, it may be rendered, "even with too much, &c." The LXX seem to have understood the passage in this manner, though their version is rather a paraphrase, than a strict translation. Τολμησασιν ατιμασαι τις ανδρας αυτων; as also the Syriac, whose version is more literal, "*Hodie dicent—de omnibus magnatibus regis omnem contemptum, & omnem indignationem.*" Neither of them seems to have read the ו before ברי, but to have understood this clause as making one sentence with the former.

JOB vi. 14. "To him that is afflicted pity (should be shewed) from his friend; but he forsaketh the fear of the Almighty." Our version here seems no  
satisfactory

satisfactory, and the original is obscure.  $\text{מִשְׁכַּח}$  the Vulgate renders, *qui tollit*; the Greek ἀνεπάτο; Syr. Arab. *prohibet*. Perhaps the word in the Hebrew should be  $\text{מִשְׁכַּח}$ , which will restore the passage to a clear sense.  $\text{ו}$  and  $\text{ב}$  are frequently interchanged, and  $\text{מִשְׁכַּח}$  signifies, *amovit*: so Zech. iii. 9.  $\text{וְיִסְכַּח אֶת עֵץ הָאֵץ}$  — *et amovebo iniquitatem*.  $\text{ל}$  often signifies, “as for” — “in respect to,” — see Gen. xxvii. 42. 1 Sam. ix. 20. Psalm xvii. 4. Ezek. x. 13. Thus we shall have a verb in the clause, which seems to be required, and the version will be,

“As for him, who removeth (or, withholdeth) mercy from a friend,

“He (that man) will also forsake the fear of the Almighty.”

A very just and important sentiment, and a sense quite agreeable to the complaint, which follows.

JOB viii. 17. “Seeth the place of stones.” — For  $\text{יִרְאֶה}$  probably we should read  $\text{יִשֵּׂה}$ , and for  $\text{בֵּית}$  we should read  $\text{בֵּין}$ . One MS hath now  $\text{בֵּין}$ ; “he shall live among the stones.” So the LXX read,  $\text{ἐν τοῖς λίθοις ζήσεται}$ .

JOB ix. 19. “Who shall set me a time to plead?” Perhaps better *him*,  $\text{ו}$  for  $\text{י}$ . So LXX read,  $\text{αὐτὸν}$ , and so the sense requires.

JOB xviii. 4. “Teareth himself in his anger.” The LXX understood this in the second person, which is more probable, this speech being addressed to Job, as appears from the context.

“Thou, that tearest thyself in thine anger (or, by thy fretfulness);

“Shall the earth be forsaken for thee?”

JOB xxii. 20. "Our substance"—קִימָנוּ Heb. For which the LXX and Vulgate read קִימָנוּ—"Is not their stability cut down?" Which is certainly more agreeable to the context.

JOB xxiv. 12. "Yet God layeth not folly to them." This appears to be by no means the sense of the passage. If it be rendered as a question we shall have a much more probable meaning.

"And will not God charge them with folly, or, guilt, unrighteousness?" for so תִּפְלוּהוּ seems to signify, chapter i. 22. "Job charged not unrighteousness to God:" and the sense of the context here seems to require, not a charge of mere folly, but of heinous wickedness and injustice. So Jer. xxiii. 13. "I have seen folly in the prophets of Samaria," rather "heinous wickedness," agreeably to what is said in the following verse, "I have seen also in the prophets of Jerusalem an horrible thing," שְׁעִרֻרָה; where תִּפְלוּהוּ answers to שְׁעִרֻרָה, and consequently implies some very great wickedness, or abomination.

JOB xxiv. 18. "He beholdeth not the way of the vineyards." This version is obscure, and the clause has much puzzled the commentators. I should rather translate the verse thus,

"He is (as) a light thing on the surface of the waters.

"Their portion is accursed in the earth;

"And the produce of their vineyards shall not be seen;"

Literally, "the way, the usual course of their vineyards shall not be seen," i. e. they should produce little or nothing. דֶּרֶךְ, signifies, "the way, custom, or usual course of a person, or thing," and the meaning seems to be, that their vineyards should not bring



bring forth their usual produce. The LXX read בְּרִמָּה, for בְּרִמָּה, by their *avro*.

JOB xxvi. 3. "How hast thou plentifully declared the thing, as it is?" Perhaps better; "and hast thou taught wisdom to the multitude?" לָרַב, agreeably to the phraseology of the preceding clauses.

JOB xxviii. 4. "The flood breaketh out from the inhabitant." This is not very intelligible. I would translate the passage thus; "The stream bursts forth out of the chalky clay." נִר, more correctly נִיר, signifies, *calca*, as in Is. xxvii. 9. where it is also written without the (י). Here it is wrongly pointed; but the LXX translate it by *νομα*, as they do in Is. xxvii. 9.

JOB xxx. 2. "In whom old age was perished." I do not well understand this. For בָּלָה, the LXX seem to have read בָּלָה, *συττελεσθαι*. The noun is often used, as an adverb, and then we shall have good sense.

"Of what advantage was the strength of their hands to me?"

"It was wholly perished in them."

JOB xxx. 13. "They have no helper." Perhaps, "There is no helper against them," which will give a sense more agreeable to the context. לָ often signifies, "against." Deut. i. 41. 2 Kings v. 7. Jer. i. 18, &c.

JOB xxx. 15. "They pursue my soul, as the wind." For תִּרְדֵּף, we should perhaps read תִּנְדֵּף; LXX *διώκειν*. נִדְבָתִי, signifies "my eminence," or "dignity."

nity," from נִרְבִּי, *nobilis, ingenuus*. The passage then might be more properly translated,

"My eminence is dissipated like the wind ;

"And my prosperity is passed away like a cloud."

Then the clauses would be parallel to each other. I would observe here, that in the antient MSS the letters נ, and ר, were probably more similar to each other, than they are at present, and therefore more likely to be taken one for the other ; which appears from the many places where it hath so happened. Thus Achan is written for Achar in Joshua, chapter vii. (vid. Ken. Diff. vol. i. p. 90.) Nebuchadnezzar, is in Jer. xxix. 21. and xlix. 28. Nebuchadrezzar, a mistake which has happened in chapter xlix. since the Greek version was made, as that has Ναβουχοδονοσορ. Rehum is in Nehem. vii. 7. Nahum. Nachon, 2 Sam. vi. 6. is expressed by Ναχαρ; and Hādar, Gen. xxv. 15. by Χοδδάρ in the Greek version. This observation may be of use for detecting errors in other places.

Job xxxvi. 20. "Desire not the night, when people are cut off in their place." This is obscure. Perhaps it might be translated, and more exactly to the original, thus:

"Desire not the night to invade the people in their place," or "within themselves"—i. e. "in their own habitations"—referring to the night-incur-sions of the Arabians, and insinuating a suspicion, that Job himself had been concerned with them in such predatory expeditions. Elihu goes all along on the supposition, that Job had been guilty of some heinous crimes, as the only way of accounting for his uncommon afflictions ; See chapter xxxiv. 8, 9, 36, 37. and verses 17 and 18 of this chapter ; and he therefore here warns him, and exhorts him to re-pentance.

penitance. So in the following verse he admonishes him, "Take heed; regard not iniquity."

Job xxxvi. 30. "Spreadeth his light upon it." Perhaps, "his vapour." For, אור, the LXX read אור, which they retain, but not translate. Chaldee also, "*pluviam suam*." The bottom, or, as it is in the Hebrew, "the roots of the sea," doth not seem an expression very intelligible in the connection in which it here stands. מִן signifies also "the west." Perhaps the verse might be thus translated;

"Behold, he spreadeth his vapour upon it," (*i. e.* his tabernacle, the heaven,)

"And covereth (with clouds) the extremities of the west; or, "the western horizon."

Job xxxvi. 33. "The noise thereof sheweth concerning it, the cattle also concerning the vapour." It is difficult to make much meaning out of this; and I have not yet met with any interpretation, that satisfies me. The cattle in the latter clause, I think, directs us to read רוע instead of רע in the former, "the shepherd;" and then we shall have a clear and proper sense. "The shepherd presages concerning it. The cattle also (presage) the rising storm:" *i. e.* they know by these tokens, that it is coming on. The sensibility of cattle to such an approaching change has been often noticed; and shepherds, whose life is passed chiefly in the open fields, attain by experience a great sagacity in such prognostications. This passage with its context appears to me to contain poetic beauties, which the critics have overlooked, and which will be more perceptible, when considered in their connection with each other; the latter part of this chapter being very improperly divided



divided from the beginning of the next; which is but a continuation of the same subject.

“ He hideth the sun with the hollow of his hand,

“ And layeth his restraint upon it by the interposing cloud.

“ The shepherd presageth concerning it;

“ The cattle also (presage) the rising storm.

“ My heart also trembleth at it;

“ And is thrown into commotion.

“ Hark! attend to the clangor of his voice,

“ The muttering peals, which issue from his mouth,” &c.

In how natural, and in how lively a manner, does Elihu describe the rise and progress of the thunder-storm! He represents it, as if it was actually before him, and by the energy of his expression makes us imagine that we see, and hear it too.

JOB xxxvii. 12. “ And it is turned about by his counsels, that they may do whatsoever he hath commanded them upon the face of the world (in) the earth.”  $\text{וְהוּא}$  seems rather to refer to God.

“ He is perpetually turning round their revolutions by his counsels,

“ That they may do whatsoever he hath commanded them,

“ On the face of the habitable earth.”

$\text{מִתְחַפֵּץ}$ , is in Hithp. which conjugation implies not only *reciprocam*, *sed frequentativam*, *vel continuam actionem*, (Bith. Gram.) So Gen. v. 22, 24. chapter vi. 9. I suspect that  $\text{מִסְבּוֹת}$  should be  $\text{מִבּוֹת}$ , the  $\text{ב}$  being transposed. The LXX refer  $\text{וְהוּא}$  to God,  $\text{Και αυτοις ανηλωνματα διεβριψεν}$ .

JOB xxxvii. 13. "He causeth it to come, whether for correction, or for his land, or for mercy." This clause seems much confused in the Hebrew. The clause "or for his land" comes in very awkwardly and confounds the sense. Perhaps the **אדמה** before **לארץ** is repeated by mistake. Perhaps also there has been a transposition of words, and the true version may be nearly thus; "He causeth it to come upon the earth, either for correction, or for mercy." The (1) at the close of **לארץ**, seems unnecessary.

JOB xli. 11. "Whatsoever is under the whole heaven is mine." There seems to be a transposition of two words in the Hebrew text. Instead of **כל תחת כל שמים**, we should read **כל שמים תחת כל**. So LXX, **ἅπαντα ὑπὸ ὅλης οὐρανόθεν**. Then there will be no occasion for the insertion of the word, "whatsoever," and the version will be; "All that is under the heavens is mine."

JOB xli. 22. "And sorrow is turned into joy before him." It is difficult to assign any meaning to this. I am apt to think we should read **תרוץ**, instead of **תרוץ**, which is read no where else. Then the version will be, "sorrow, or fear, runs before him," i. e. his presence causes immediate consternation. So the LXX seem to have understood it, whose version is, **ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ τρέχει ἀπολαῖα**. Vulg. *precedit*.

PSALM viii. 2. "Ordained strength." Heb. **עוֹז**. In Matt. xxi. 16. it is rendered **αἶνον**, "praise," which seems to disagree with the original. But I apprehend, that the word **עוֹז** did signify, "praise," or "glory," or "honor," as well as "strength;" as the LXX translate it here **αἶνον**, and in Ps. lxviii. 25. **δόξα**, and in Ps. xxix. 1. **יוֹד**. So that the New Testament,

Testament and LXX will agree with the Hebrew text here, where it certainly means praise, as is evident from the words with which it is connected; "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained praise."

PSALM x. vi. "He hath said in his heart, I shall not be moved, for I shall never be in adversity." Perhaps better, "He hath said in his heart, I shall not be moved for ever, because (אשר) he hath not been in adversity." He saith this from the confidence which his present prosperous circumstances give him. אשר often signifies "because;" so we render it, Ps. lv. 19. where the sentiment is the same, "Because they have no changes, therefore they fear not God." The position of the words in the Hebrew will not admit of our version above, which supposes אשר before לדר ודר, whereas it is after it.

PSALM xiii. 2. "Take counsel in my soul"—Heb. עצה; perhaps עצב. So the Syriac seems to have read, *maerorem*, Æth. *tristitiam*; which seems better to agree with the corresponding word following, גון, before which, it is likely, a vau is wanting. Then the version would be, "How long shall I indulge grief, or, anxiety in my soul, and daily sorrow in my heart?" Schultens and Cocceius make the primitive signification of עצב, to be, "to bind hard, or gird," (vid. Taylor's Concord. in verbo.) Hence it denotes labour of body, and probably that sorrow of the mind which results from anxious fears and perplexity. Such an anxiety seems to suit the Psalmist's circumstances in this place.

PSALM



PSALM xii. 5. "I will set (him) in safety (from him that) puffeth at him." The original here has no sense. That there is an error may be well suspected, since, in order to make some sense, our translators found it necessary to supply a preposition, a pronoun, and a relative before *יָצַד*. That there should be an ellipsis of all these together seems irreconcilable to the rules of grammar in any language. The LXX and Chaldee read this verb in the first person, as the preceding verbs *אָקַד*, and *אָשַׁן*. The LXX translate this last clause, *παρηγοροῦμαι ἐν αὐτῷ*. Chald. Syr. and Arab. read not *יָצַד*, whatever they might read. Qu. Whether the LXX might not read *אֶחָדָו* instead of *יָצַד*—"I will make him to hope, or, inspire him with confidence." So that word is used, Ps. cxix. 49. *יָצַדְתִּי*; "Thou hast made me to hope." The difference between the words is not great.

PSALM xxii. Christian commentators are generally agreed, that this psalm is prophetic of the Messiah. The most however seem to think, that David speaks in his own person those things which originally and literally related to himself, and only figuratively to the Messiah. I am rather of opinion, that this psalm respects the Messiah originally and solely. There is nothing in it, which may not suit the Messiah as well as David; but there are some things which more properly belong to the Messiah than to David; and there are some other things also which seem not at all applicable to David, but peculiarly so to the Messiah, and which in fact did happen to him; such as piercing his hands and feet, parting his garments, &c. sufficiently noticed by commentators. On these things I shall not enlarge here; but will add some other things, which I have not

not seen mentioned, or not so particularly considered, as, I think, they deserve. In the 8th verse, we have indeed what his enemies might say of David; but we know not that they did say it. But with respect to the Messiah we know it to be fact. His enemies did say this of him, and in him was this prediction completely and literally fulfilled; and it appears probable, that his enemies were over-ruled at that time by a particular interposition of Providence, to make use of these words of the Psalm, on the occasion on which it was predicted that they would make use of them. And our blessed Lord might afterwards refer the Jews to this Psalm by quoting the first verse of it, Matthew xxvii. 46, with this view principally, to intimate to them, that he was that very person intended in the prophecy, and that they had now unwittingly fulfilled some of its predictions, and this in particular.\* In short, that  
David

\* I am inclined to think that the design of our blessed Lord, in quoting the first verse of this Psalm, was to refer the Jews to the whole psalm, as a prediction of what then had happened, and consequently of his being the Messiah there predicted, rather than to apply that particular passage to his present circumstances. When a person would refer to any particular hymn or psalm, it was a natural method to cite the first verse, as we often refer to a particular hymn by quoting the first verse, as *Te Deum*, *Nunc dimittis*. That this was the practice of the antient Jews seems probable. We find the psalm of praise usually sung in the temple-worship and on other solemn occasions referred to by quoting the first verse, or part of it, 2 Chron. v. 13. vii. 3. xx. 21. Ezra iii. 11. Jeremiah xxxiii. 11. By considering the quotation in this light we shall avoid the many difficulties which attend the common interpretation, *i. e.* of Christ's complaining that God had forsaken him in his present distress.

David doth not speak of himself in this psalm; but that the Messiah is here represented, as speaking in his own person, the things which relate to his own sufferings, and the propagation of the gospel, appears to me very clear from the testimony of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who in chap. ii. ver. 12, quotes the 22d verse of this psalm, as the words of Christ himself; "For which cause he (*i. e.* Christ) is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the congregation I will sing praises unto thee." Now if David spake here in his own person, how could the inspired writer say with truth, "that Christ said this?" If then we believe his testimony, we must allow, that Christ is here represented, as speaking in his *own person*, what related to himself alone and not to another. I know not how otherwise to establish the apostle's veracity. This appears to me totally to distinguish his quotation from a figurative completion, or accommodation, and to appropriate it to the Messiah originally, and solely. Besides, the design of the apostle is to prove, that Christ and his people are all of one (*father*); and his argument is, that Christ calls them brethren; but if Christ did not say so in this prophecy, but another person, and that for himself originally, and for Christ only figuratively, his argument would seem to be both impertinent and false.

But what I principally intend to observe is this, that the Greek version fixes the application of this prophecy to the Messiah personally and originally much more strongly than the Hebrew text. These variations of the Greek have been noticed by others, but not applied by them, as far as I know, to the purpose I intend.

In



In the present Hebrew the latter part of the 29th verse runs, וְנִפְשׁוֹ לֹא חָיָה, as we render it, "none can keep alive his own soul," or more literally, "and he shall not cause his soul to live." But who is meant here? No particular person is mentioned in the text, to whom *he* can be referred, the antecedents in the preceding clauses being plural. But in the Greek version we read, καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ζῇ. They read probably, וְנִפְשׁוֹ לִי חָיָה, "but my soul liveth unto him," or "liveth again into him," as נִפְשׁוֹ also signifies; which is very agreeable to the apostle's expression concerning Christ, Romans vi. 10; "In that he liveth, he liveth unto God." Here then appears to me a plain prophecy of the resurrection of Christ. This clause seems designed in opposition to what goes immediately before; "All that go down to the dust shall bow before Him," *i. e.* all mortals; "but I (says the Messiah, who is here represented as speaking) shall not remain in the power of the grave like them, but live again to God." The preceding verb in the sentence being future gives the future sense to this also.

Now that the Greek version has given us the genuine sense of the passage, and that the Hebrew copies read so at the time of making that version, I have no doubt, as the other versions, the Syriac, Vulgate, Arabic, and Æthiopic, all conspire to confirm the sense of the Septuagint. The Syriac read exactly the same, *anima mea ipsi vivit*. The Chaldee Targum indeed translates it, *et animam impii non vivificabit*; but that Targum on the Psalms is of too late a date to be of any authority, and possibly was written after the text became corrupted. It does not however express the present reading, there being no word for *impii* in our present Hebrew copies.

In

In the next verse the Greek translators read, חרע, instead of ורע, as in the present text, and the reading in that whole verse is very different from the present Heb. καὶ τὸ σπέρμα μου δαμάσκει αὐτὰ, ἀναγγελλόμενοι τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡ γενεὰ ἡ ἐρχομένη, "My seed shall serve him, and the generation to come shall be accounted the Lord's." The LXX seem to have read חרע instead of ורע. The word ורע, "my seed," appropriates the passage to the Messiah, who is here speaking; whereas in the Hebrew the application of it is vague, and uncertain. The Vulgate, Arabic, and Æthiopic agree here with the LXX.

There is another variation of the like kind between the Hebrew and the Greek version in the 24th verse. The Hebrew runs, "Neither hath he hid his face from *him*, but when *he* cried unto him, he heard;" referring to some afflicted person, without specifying any; But in the Greek version the speaker appropriates what is said to himself. "Neither hath he hid his face from *me*, and when *I* cried unto him, he heard *me*." Here the Messiah is represented as speaking, in his own person, of what should happen to himself, and did actually happen, agreeably to what the apostle says, Hebrews v. 7, probably with this very passage in his eye. Here then seems to be a prediction of a particular and important circumstance in the history of Christ, which is quite obscured and lost in the Hebrew text by being applied to some other person, or to the afflicted who pray to God indefinitely.

The 31st verse seems to have a reference to the calling of the Gentiles; "They shall declare his righteousness to a people that shall be born, (בולד)." The Gentiles are spoken of in a similar manner in other places of scripture, as a people which then were not but should be, Deut. xxxii. 21. Rom. x. 19.

Y Peter

i Peter ii. 10. In the following clause, which concludes the psalm, the Hebrew is כִּי עָשָׂה, which we render, "that he hath done (this);" but which would be more properly rendered, "which (i. e. the people) he hath made, or ordained;" according to the sense in which the LXX understood it, ὅς ἐποίησεν, ὁ Κυριος, "which the Lord hath made," prepared or ordained to be his people, as was the case of the Gentiles. They were not his people, but he had ordained and so ordered things, that they should one day become his people, through the preaching of the gospel of Christ. With the LXX here agree the Syr. Vulg. and Æthiop.

Thus it appears, that the application of this important prophecy to Christ, personally and solely, hath been perverted, and its express predictions of his resurrection and the propagation of his gospel have been either wholly lost, or greatly obscured by corruptions in the Hebrew text. Whether these corruptions were the effect of error or design I pretend not to determine; but so many and such important alterations, all tending to pervert and obscure the prophecy, give ample room for suspicion; particularly in the 29th and 30th verses.

The 16th verse hath afforded ground for suspicion already, and there are MSS now existing which have כָּאֵרִי or כָּאֵרִי; and in the present instances the versions combine to detect the corruptions, however they might happen. The latter part of this psalm then, from the 24th verse to the end, the more material variations of the LXX being adopted, might be thus translated.

24. For he hath not despised, nor regarded with aversion the affliction of the wicked:

Neither hath he hid his face from me;

But when I cried unto Him He heard me.

B b b

25. Thou



25. Thou shalt be the subject of my praise, in the great congregation;  
I will pay my vows in the presence of them who fear Him (perhaps, *thee*).
26. The poor <sup>a</sup> shall eat and be satisfied;  
They who seek Jehovah shall praise him;  
Their heart <sup>b</sup> shall live for ever.
27. All the ends of the earth shall make memorial, <sup>c</sup>  
(or offer incense,) and turn unto Jehovah;  
And all the families of the nations shall worship before Him. <sup>d</sup>
28. For the kingdom is Jehovah's,  
And He is the ruler among the nations.
29. All the rich <sup>e</sup> of the earth shall eat (of his sacrifices), and worship;  
Before him shall bow all who go down to the dust;  
But my soul shall live (again) to Him.
30. My seed shall serve him;  
The generation to come shall be accounted the Lord's;
31. And they shall declare his righteousness (or, saving mercy) to a people which shall be born;  
Which Jehovah <sup>f</sup> hath ordained.

N. B. There

<sup>a</sup> "The poor." So LXX; reading עניים, *aninim*. Vulg. *pauperes*.

<sup>b</sup> "Their heart." So LXX and other versions. One MS reads now לבבם, more agreeably to the context.

<sup>c</sup> "Make memorial," or "offer incense." This seems to be the import of עָבַד here, where it refers to worship.

<sup>d</sup> "Before Him." LXX *ante*, more properly.

<sup>e</sup> "The rich," Heb. דשני. LXX. *piotes*, fat, or rich; so Homer, *πῖος πῖον*, "rich temple." Il. ii. 549. *πῖος*, "wealthy people." Il. xvi. 673.

<sup>f</sup> It appears by the word *Κυεῖας*, that the LXX read Jehovah in their copies.

N. B. There are a few other variations between the Hebrew and the Greek in this psalm, though not of much importance. I shall take notice of the following.

Verse 3. English translation. "But thou art holy, (O thou) that inhabitest the praises of Israel." "To inhabit praise" seems an unusual, and not a very intelligible expression. Instead of the plural תהלת, as in the present Hebrew text, the Greek read תהלת, singular, (in Regim.) which gives a preferable sense, *Σὺ δὲ ἐν ἁγίῳ κατοικεῖς, ὁ ἱεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*, "But thou dwellest in the sanctuary, the praise of Israel," or perhaps it might be better rendered thus, connecting it with the verse following;

O thou who inhabitest the sanctuary, the praise of Israel,

Thou our fathers trusted, &c.

The *vau* here does not seem to be a copulative. It is frequently redundant, or only gives an emphasis to the sentence, and is sometimes used as a vocative, Is. lvii. 3. *ואתה*, "O ye! approach hither." Ezek. vii. 2. "O thou (*ואתה*) Son of Man," and chapter xxi. 25. "O thou (*ואתה*) prophane wicked prince of Israel!" That God is meant above by "the praise of Israel," seems clear from Deut. x. 21. where the same expression is applied to him "He is thy praise," and Jer. xvii. 14. "Thou art my praise."

PSALM xxvii. 12, 13. "For false witnesses are risen up against me, and such as breathe out cruelty, (I had fainted) unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living." On this passage I would observe. 1st. That the verb, *וַיִּפֶּן*, should have been *וַיִּפְּנוּ*, plural, to agree with *עָרִי*; accordingly our translators have rendered it plural, though not authorized by the text. So Chaldee and Syriac.

Syriac. 2dly. The beginning of the 13th verse is imperfect. This our translators were sensible of, by supplying the clause (I had fainted). 3dly. the LXX translate it  $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\upsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\ \iota\delta\epsilon\iota\omega$ . They had not לולא in their copies; nor Syriac, nor Arabic. 4thly. The LXX, in the latter part of the former verse, have  $\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ , and the Arabic *seipsum*. They seem to have read there, לו, or עלו, or עלי. I therefore suspect that, לולא is a corruption, and suppose the original to have stood nearly thus; ויפחוחם על יהאמנתי—The antient MSS were written without any space between the words and sentences; and the LXX might read עלי, as one word; which will account for their  $\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ , and the Arabic *seipsum*. If עלי stood originally as above, then לו will belong to the 12th verse, and the (ו) seems to be required at the beginning of the 13th. The Syriac has, *Ego vero credidi*. It is likely therefore, that the author of this version read the (ו) here. לו might be easily corrupted into לולא, as many MSS now have it, and from thence into לולא. The word is wanting in three. That there has been a corruption here is further probable from observing, that in the pointed Hebrew copies it is dotted over, לולא, as if spurious, or dubious, or incorrect. The version of this passage thus corrected will be,

“ False witnesses are risen up against me,  
 “ And they breathe out violence against me;  
 “ But I will trust to see the goodness of Jehovah,  
 “ In the land of the living.”

PSALM xxxv. 7. “ Without cause they have hid for me their net (in) a pit, which without cause, they have digged for my soul.” The awkwardness and confusion of this sentence might lead one to suspect an error somewhere. The Hebrew literally translated is, “ For without a cause they have hid for



for me a pit; without cause they have digged their net for my soul." Where it appears evidently, that the verbs קָמְנוּ, "hid," and חָפְרוּ, "digged," have changed places; a mistake the more likely to happen, as they both follow the same word חַיִּים. This error rectified, the sense will be clear;

"For without cause they have digged for me a pit;

"Without cause they have hid their net for my life."

PSALM xxxvii. 14. "Such as be of upright conversation." Heb. יִשְׂרֵי דֶרֶךְ. The LXX have *καὶ ἀνθρώπων*; and many MSS have לב, instead of דֶרֶךְ, "the upright in heart." This clause also makes a Hemistick too much in this verse: perhaps it belonged to verse 7, where a Hemistick seems wanting, and which place it very well suits, "Because of the man who contriveth wicked devices, to slay the upright in heart."

PSALM xl. 6. "Required"—Heb. שְׁאֵלוֹת. So LXX, *αἰτήσεις*. But the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews x. 6. hath, *αἰτεῖσθε*. Perhaps he might read שְׁאֵלוֹת in his copy.

PSALM lviii. 1. "Congregation." Heb. אֱלִים. I much doubt of the signification given to this word here. The LXX render it *ἀρχαί*; Syriac *certe*; Vulgate *utique*. They read differently from the present text; perhaps they might have אֱלִים in their copies; but אֱלִים, *certè*, would be superfluous and tautological after הַמְּאִמְנִים, which signifies the same. I suspect the original word to have been אֱלִים, (made אֱלִים, by the omission of the (י) a letter frequently dropped) "Ye mighty, ye magistrates, or chief rulers," which אֱלִים and אֱלֹהִים frequently denote. Vid. Ps. lxxxii. verses

verses 1, 2. 6. מל; LXX. Θιου, reading probably מל plural. Where the sentiments are similar, and those passages seem to explain this. Further, this correction would restore the parallelism between the two clauses agreeably to the usual poetic style of the scriptures;

“ Do ye indeed speak righteousness, O ye rulers ?

“ Do ye judge uprightly, O ye sons of men ?

In the verse following, the phrase, “ You weigh the violence of your hands in the earth,” is strange and obscure. The LXX translate the verb, <sup>συσμετρουσιν</sup> the Chald. Arab. and Vulg. to the like sense. They also read the verb in the third person, and ידכ as its nominative case. LXX <sup>αυτων χειρες ουκ εστιν</sup> <sup>αυτων χειρες ουκ εστιν</sup> <sup>αυτων χειρες ουκ εστιν</sup>, which certainly makes better sense; they probably read תפלון, instead of תפלסון.

PSALM lviii. 7. “ (When) he bendeth (his bow to shoot) his arrows, let them be as cut in pieces.” Perhaps for כמו, “ as,” which greatly embarrasses the sense, we should read במו, which often signifies “ at, or, against,” as Ps. x. 5. בדם, “ at them.” Then the sense will be clear; “ He will shoot his arrows at them, they shall be utterly destroyed.” Chald. *intendit sagittas suas propter eos*. The author did not read כמו, but might read במו. Or we might translate כמו, “ until,” as the LXX <sup>αχρις</sup> <sup>αχρις</sup> <sup>αχρις</sup>, and the Vulg. *donec*; so also Syr. which seems to make the best sense. “ He will shoot his arrows, until they are utterly consumed.” Perhaps כ here may be for כי, which sometimes signifies, “ until,” as Is. xvi. 4. “ Let my outcasts dwell with thee, O Moab ! until (כי) the oppressor ceaseth.” It certainly at least signifies, “ that, so that,” which sense will do here, “ So that they may be utterly destroyed.”

PSALM lxxv. 3. "Iniquities prevail against me." For מִן the LXX read מֵנו, "over us," which seems more agreeable to the context; "as for our transgressions." Many MSS have מִנו.

PSALM lxxix. 26. "Those whom thou hast wounded." I should rather read the word in the singular number, הַלֵּל, "thy wounded one," or, "him whom thou hast wounded," both the clauses probably relating to one person, the speaker himself. The Greek, Arab. and Vulg. versions have here, "my wounds," referring to one person only, the speaker himself. If it be supposed, that Christ is here represented, as speaking of those things which should happen to himself, this variation is of importance; as the reference to the Messiah personally is entirely lost in the Hebrew text here, which speaks of more persons, than one. The Greek, Syr. Vulg. and Arab. also read מִסְפֵּי, for מִסְפֵּי, which seems preferable, and the version will then be;

"For they persecute him, whom thou hast smitten;  
"And add to the grief of him, whom thou hast wounded."

PSALM lxxiii. 10. "Therefore his people return hither."—It is difficult to explain what is meant by the word, "hither."—Perhaps מִלֵּו, or more correctly מִלֵּוּ, may be here the participle passive from מִלֵּו, *contudit*; then the version will be; "Therefore his people return stricken, or, smitten," i. e. insulted and oppressed by the wicked above mentioned, who are represented as proud oppressors. This sense will be quite agreeable to the following clause; "and waters of a full cup are wrung out unto them."

PSALM



“PSALM lxxvi. 6. “The chariot, and the horse.” Perhaps better, “the rider and the horse”—as more agreeable to what follows, “are cast into a deep sleep;” which is not properly applicable to the chariot. In this sense the LXX, Syr. Vulg. For this signification of רכב, see more in note on Exod. xiv. 11.

“PSALM lxxvii. 10. “And I said, this is my infirmity (but I will remember) the years of the right-hand of the most high.” This is very obscure. It is difficult to understand, what is meant by, “the years of the right-hand of the most high.” The antient versions differ much in their translations, but the best sense I can draw from them, and the present text, is; “And I said, this is my infirmity, the change of the right-hand of the Most High.” The sense however is abrupt, and the expression unusual. The difficulty lies in the word שנות, where I suspect there has been some alteration, and that early, by the transposition of two letters, and the omission of a (י), which is a very common one, especially when another (י) comes before or after it. Supposing the text to have been originally written thus, ונשתי ימין עליון, it might easily have been changed into שנות ימין עליון, by an error of the transcriber. ונשתי, for ונשאתי, as in that verb the נ is often omitted—as Ezek. xxix 26, ונשתי, Job xli. 25. (17 Heb.) Jer. ix. 18. (17 Heb.) Ruth i. 14. Pf. xxxii. 1. and probably Pf. iv. 6. נשתי for נשח. Then the version may be;

“And I said, this is my infirmity; or, my affliction,”

(i. e. the affliction appointed for me,)

“And I will bear the right-hand of the most high.”

“The hand of the Lord” is often used to denote his

his providential dispensations, whether of judgment, or of mercy, and his right-hand particularly, Hab. ii. 16. "the cup of Jehovah's right-hand." The sense here supposed appears to me most agreeable to the context, and to the main design of the psalm. The psalmist, having indulged a strain of complaint, checks himself, and professes submission, that he would bear the affliction appointed by God, and meditate on his works of old to confirm his faith and patience. And I am the more inclined to think this the real sense of the passage, as in Jer. x. 19, we have exactly the same sentiment, and in very nearly the same expressions. "But I said, surely this is an affliction," (וְלִי, perhaps, "my affliction," the affix (י) being frequently omitted after another (י); and the sense seems to require the pronoun; "and I must, or, will bear it." Here the prophet seems to have an eye to this passage of the psalmist, and to copy his sentiments, and manner, and even his expression. וְלִי and וְאֲשַׁנּוּ, answer to וְלִי, and וְאֲשַׁנּוּ, in the psalm. We have the like sentiment, Micah vii. 9. "I will bear (אֲשַׁנּוּ) the indignation of Jehovah."

PSALM lxxviii. 41. "Limited." Heb. מְהֵרָה. I doubt this word. The LXX, by their παραμυῖαν, seem to have read הִמְרִי, which they translate elsewhere by παραμυῖα, as Deut. ix. 7. With the LXX agree Syr. Vulg. Arab. and Æthiop. The version then will be, "They provoked the Holy One of Israel."

PSALM lxxx. 6. "Laugh among themselves;" more probably, "at us," לָנוּ. So LXX, Syr. and Vulg. One MS. No. 82, read לָנוּ, *primò*.

PSALM lxxxi. 16. "Satisfied thee." So Hebrew. The sense requires, "them." So LXX and Vulg.

PSALM lxxii. 6, 7. "I said, ye are gods, and all of you are children of the most high. But ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes." Heb. כִּמְדֵּי הַמְּלָכִים תָּמוּתוּ. Like what prince? and how did these princes die? Here seems no meaning, or at least great obscurity. Nor is the expression suited to the apparent design of the passage, where an opposition seems intended. "Ye are gods," (אֱלֹהִים, rulers, magistrates) "but ye shall die like common men," (כְּאָדָם), Again, "Ye are sons of the most high," (which is but another title for princes, rulers, or magistrates,) "but ye shall fall like"—what? "one of the princes." But they themselves were princes, or rulers; here is no contrast; yet the general turn of the passage makes us expect it. Query then, might not הַמְּלָכִים be written for הַמְּסֻרִים, or הַמְּסֻרִים? שׁ is frequently used for ס; and is so in this very verb סָר, Hosea ix. 12. בְּשׁוּרִי, "in my departing." סָר, or סֻר, are in use in the Old Testament, and in Jer. vi. 28. מְסֻרִים סֻרִים, *perversi perversorum*. Then the version will be,

"I have said, ye are gods,  
 "And all of you, the children of the most high:  
 "But ye shall die like common men,  
 "And fall like one of the common transgressors,  
 or, backsliders:"

whom it is your duty as magistrates to punish, but whom ye protect, favour, and imitate. Here the opposition is kept up throughout.

PSALM lxxxix. 50. "Remember, O Lord, the reproach of thy servants, (how) I do bear in my bosom, &c." Our translators supply, *how*; the LXX seem to have read אֲשֶׁר here "אֲשֶׁר"; perhaps, "Remember, O Lord, the reproach of thy servants, which



which I bear in my bosom"—"which I bear on my heart," we should say in our modern phrase.

PSALM xci. 9. "Because thou hast made Jehovah my refuge, the most high thy habitation." This passage doth not seem to be naturally expressed; there is a confusion, which implies some error. One MS reads מוֹחָס for מוֹחָסִי, which is better, and will restore the parallelism.

"Because thou hast made Jehovah a refuge,  
"The most High thy habitation."

(י) is sometimes written for (ה), as שָׁדִי for שָׁדָה, Ps. xcvi. 12. Is. lvi. 9. After all, "thy," seems to be wanting after מוֹחָס, to make the parallelism complete.

PSALM xciv. 11. "Thoughts of man. So Heb. אָדָם. The apostle Paul's quotation, 1 Cor. iii. 20, disagrees here with the Hebrew text. He seems to have read חָכָם for אָדָם, חָכָם וְעָסָה, being necessary to his argument, which relates not to the vanity of men's thoughts in general, but to the vanity of the thoughts of those, who in this world are accounted wise; compare verses 18 and 19. It appears probable to me, that the Hebrew text read so originally, otherwise I do not see how the fairness of the apostle's quotation can be vindicated, or his argument supported by it. The present LXX (Vat.) hath indeed τὰς ἀφροσύνας, otherwise the New Testament quotation agrees with it word for word, and seems taken from it; from whence it may be suspected, that the Greek version read τὰς ἀφροσύνας at that time, but hath since been made conformable to the corrupted Hebrew. חָכָם might be easily turned into אָדָם; ה' and א' differ but little in sound, and the כ, the

the lower part obliterated, might be taken for γ, i. e. supposing it happened merely by the errors of the transcribers. But I lay the chief stress on the honesty and veracity of the Apostle, who would not have said, it was so written, if it had not been so written in his copy; much less have altered it in quoting to serve his particular purpose, and drawn an argument for divine truth from what, he must know, was but little better than a forgery. The apostles in their quotations might not be very nice about merely verbal differences, and immaterial variations, which did not affect the sense and meaning of the word of God, in the passages they quoted; but the difference here with respect to the Apostle's argument is very material.

PSALM xcv. 9—11. There are some differences between the Hebrew text here, and the Apostle's quotation in Heb. iii. 9, 10, 11. the most material of which I shall take notice of in vindication of the Apostle.

1st. In the Apostle's quotation, the words "forty years" are joined with the 9th verse, "and saw my works forty years." Then he begins another clause, *διὸ προσωχθισα*, therefore was I grieved," in which he differs from the Hebrew, which has no word to answer to *διὸ*, and makes "forty years" the beginning of the 10th verse. So the present LXX also. The Apostle's reading however is confirmed by a Hebrew MS. N°. 474, which reads ואקום, "and," or "therefore" (*διὸ*, as I often implies) "I was grieved."

2dly. "It is a people that do err in their hearts." Heb. *עם חע לבב הם*. Here the Apostle's quotation also differs, *αἱ πλυνόμεναι τῇ καρδίᾳ*, and his reading is confirmed by the LXX and Vulgate; and by one Hebrew MS, which hath *עו*, *continuò*, *perpetuò*, for

ע, and thus far confirms the Apostle's reading. It also proves, that the Hebrew copies varied here, and in this case surely the most antient copies, *i. e.* those of the Septuagint and Vulgate translators, and of the author to the Hebrews, ought to be preferred to the present. For תע, the antient copies most probably read תע, and perhaps בלב for לבב.

3dly. "To whom I swear," the Apostle ὅς, "So I swear." Heb. אשר, which the LXX render as the Apostle; and the Vulgate ut. אשר therefore may bear the signification of ὅς, "so," "so that." Let me add the following places, where the LXX translate it ὅς, or ὡς, as Deut. xxviii. 35. 2 Chron. i. 12. 1 Kings iii. 12. Jer. xix. 3. Thus both our translators and the LXX render it in the following instances, 2 Kings ix. 37. LXX ὡς μὴ εἶπεν, "(so) that they should not say," (so, indeed is in italics,) 1 Kings iii. 13. LXX ὡς, "So that there shall not be." In the following places our translators render it so, where the LXX do not, Gen. xiii. 16. "So that, if a man can number," and 1 Kings iii. 12. "So that there was none." In Dan. ix. 12. אשר, אשר in opposition may be properly rendered by "so—as"—"So that it hath not been done under all the heavens, as it hath been done in Jerusalem." I have taken more particular notice of this sense of אשר, as it may be of use for the more correct translation of other places. All these things considered, the Apostle's quotation is, I think, sufficiently vindicated.

PSALM CXV. 18. The LXX have here ἀλλὰ μέντοι ζῶντες, but the Hebrew word for ζῶντες (חיים) is now dropped. This is a material variation, as the omission of the word, "living," spoils the sense, and destroys the opposition manifestly designed between this



this and the foregoing verse. The propriety of its being restored will plainly appear on reading the two verses together, with the word in its proper place.

“ The dead praise not the Lord,  
 “ Nor any that go down into silence;  
 “ But we, the living, will bless the Lord,  
 “ From this time forth, and for evermore.”

That it was in the text originally is further probable from the words of Hezekiah, *Is. xxxviii. 18, 19.* who makes use of the like kind of opposition, and seems to have had his eye on this passage.

“ For the grave cannot praise thee;  
 “ Death cannot celebrate thee;  
 “ They that go down to the pit cannot hope  
 for thy truth;  
 “ The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I  
 do this day.”

Comparing this psalm with the *LXX*, and other versions, and with the parallel places in *Pf. cxxxv.* we shall detect many other omissions, though not so material as this. In verse 16. “ The heavens, the heavens,” seem an unnecessary repetition. The *LXX* read, *השמי השמי, ουρανος τε ουρανος.* “ The heaven of heavens is Jehovah’s.”

PSALM CXIX. 113. “ I hate (vain) thoughts.” The Hebrew runs, “ I hate thoughts,” *אבדע*; our translators have added, “ vain,” to make some sense of it; but the antient versions read differently. The *LXX* have *παρανομος*. *Vulg. iniquos.* To which agree the *Syr.* and *Arab.* I conjecture that the original word might be *אשע*, which by the transposition of the letters might easily become *אעפ*,  
 and

מַחְשָׁבֹת, *cogitationes*; for that word is spelt both with a ו and a ב, as in many other words they are used indifferently. So in Job iv. 13. and chap. xx. 22. it is spelt with a ו, here with a ב. The version then will be, "I hate the ungodly, or, transgressors."

N. B. Since I made this note, I find that Mr. Hallet supposes the original word to have been מַלְפִּי, but I cannot find, that the LXX render מִלִּי, by παρανομία, or παρανομος, or ανομος, but פשע they often translate by παρανομος, (Pl. xxxvii. 38.) ανομος, and ανομια.

PSALM cxix. 128. "Therefore I esteem all (thy) precepts (concerning) all (things to be) right." Here our translators endeavour to make sense of that which has none. The Hebrew which runs thus, עֲלֵינוּ כָּל פְּקוּדֵי כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל — "wherefore all my precept all I esteem right," which can have no meaning. Probably it should be read thus, עֲלֵינוּ כָּל פְּקוּדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. "Wherefore I esteem all thy precepts to be right." That כָּל פְּקוּדֵי should be פְּקוּדֵי, is proved by the LXX, who have νομοι σου, but take no notice of this latter כָּל; so Vulg. *mandata tua*; to which agree the Syr. and Arab. And the mistake was not difficult. The ה was most probably written originally after כ in the affix of the second person masculine, before points came in use, which have since excluded the ה, and other vowels. The Jewish critics themselves allow, that the Kametz included the ה, i. e. in fact, it hath excluded it. And the Hebrew MSS, which we now have without points, being written after the points came into general use, have been made for the most part conformable to the pointed copies. If then it was originally written

written פקד' כח, it might, by writing erroneously ל for כ, become פקד' כל, as the Hebrew now stands. פקד' has no form of construction consistent with any true sense, for "my precept," here would be absurd; "thy" is evidently necessary, which our translators have therefore supplied; and the latter כל is superfluous.

PSALM cxxx. 5, 6. The LXX join the verb, that closes the 5th verse with the 6th, reading I suppose חוולתי for חוולתי, referring to נפש following, נפשו, and perhaps rightly; otherwise there would be a necessary verb wanting in the 6th verse, and in the 5th there are two already; and they read no (ו) before לדבריו, nor does one MS. (They read indeed לדברך, "thy word;" and so do two MSS. So in the first clause they have, "I wait on thee, O Lord"). The repetition at the close is not in the LXX, and seems an unnecessary one. One MS hath it not. Probably it was occasioned by an error in the transcriber. The version then may be;

"I wait on Jehovah; my soul doth wait on his word;

"My soul hopeth for the Lord, from the night-watch to the morning."

PSALM cxl. 8, 9. The construction of these verses is confused, and the sense obscure. I have a suspicion that Selah is wrongly placed between, רומו and ראש. Nor does ראש singular agree with the plural following, according to our translation; "(As for) the head of those, that rise up against me, let the mischief of their own lips cover them." For רומו, two MSS read רימו, and the LXX, by their מוטו, seem to have read פו before it, which our translators adopt, and which



is necessary to the sense. Perhaps therefore the text might originally stand "מן ידיו ראש מסב" "Left those that encompass me should lift up the head," which will clear the sense. In the following clause, for יסמו plural many MSS read יסמו singular, more properly to agree with עמל. The LXX also have "αυτοι", singular.

PROV. ii. 7. "He layeth up sound wisdom for the righteous, (he is) a buckler to them that walk uprightly." For תושיה the LXX read תשועה, σωτηρια. Then the version will be:

"He treasureth up salvation for the righteous,"

"A buckler for them that walk uprightly."

This will form a more perfect parallelism between the two clauses.

PROV. vi. 11. "One that travelleth." Better, "highway-man." LXX αμαρ οδοντορος. The word is evidently used here in its bad sense.

PROV. vi. 22. "When thou goest"—בחתחלקך, Hithp. implies constant, or, continued walking, the daily course of life. There is a passage in Cicero's oration for Archias, which much resembles this, *Hec Studia—pernoctant nobiscum, perigrinantur, rusticantur.*

PROV. vii. 22, 23. Query—Whether, after all that hath been said about the word עמל, the reading of the Greek version may not be the right? (which Pole in Syn. notes, is followed by the Chald. Syr. and Arab.) We generally allow a corruption in one word, and borrow the assistance of the LXX to correct it, *i. e.* with respect to איל; why may we not suppose a corruption in another word, and avail our-

selves of the like assistance? The version of the LXX runs—*ὡς περὶ βοῦς ἐπὶ σφαγῇ κτείνεται, καὶ ὡς περὶ κυνὸς ἐπὶ δεσμῷ, καὶ ὡς λαφὸς τοῦ θυμῶτος ἐπὶ σφαγῇ*—The original might be, —כְּשֹׁר אֶל סִבְחָ יָבֵא וּכְלָב אֶל מוֹסֶר וְאֵיל עַד יִפְלֹחַ—“as an ox goeth to the slaughter, and as a dog to the halter, or, chain, and a hart (goeth on) till the dart strikes through his liver.” It may then well be suspected, that וּכְעֶכֶם has taken the place of וּכְלָב, and many as great corruptions have happened in the Hebrew text. The (ו) before אֵיל may be naturally supposed; and the present word אֵיל might arise from the transcriber's error in putting the (ו) after the (א) instead of before it. “As a dog to his chain,” seems to have been a common proverb, and is as proper as the other instances here mentioned. The Vulg. (Poli Syn.) has it, *quasi agnus*; it read not then וּכְעֶכֶם, but probably, וּכְכֶשֶׁב, which differs but one letter from וּכְלָב.

PROV. x. xvi. “The labour of the righteous tendeth to life; the fruit of the wicked to sin.” May not חַטָּאת here mean “punishment,” that punishment which is the consequence of sin? So it seems to do in some other places, as Numb. xxxii. 23. If. liii. 12. Zech. xiv. 19. In this last instance our translators so render it. So also עֵץ is used—Gen. xix. 15. Lev. v. 1. Ezek. xiv. 10. chap. xxxv. 5. Lament. iv. 22. and perhaps Gen. iv. 13. Then there will be a more proper contrast between the two clauses, as in chap. xi. 19.

“As righteousness tendeth to life;

“So he that pursueth evil, (pursueth it) to his own death.”

PROV. xi. 7. “When a wicked man dieth, his expectations shall perish, and the hope of unjust men perisheth.”

perisheth." This seems mere tautology. The LXX read differently, and in their version, we have a proper opposition;

"When a righteous man dieth, his hope doth not perish;

"But the confidence of the ungodly perisheth."

PROV. xi. 9. "The hypocrite by his mouth destroyeth his neighbour; but through knowlege shall the just be delivered." Instead of רעו singular the LXX read רעים plural *πονηταις*. One MS has רעה. Then the version will be;

"By his mouth the hypocrite destroyeth his neighbours;

"But by the knowlege of the just shall they" (his neighbours) "be delivered."

Then there will be a proper opposition between the two clauses, which is now wanting.

PROV. xiv. 24. "The foolishness of fools is folly." Heb. אולת כסילים אולת. This is mere tautology. The LXX did not read the first אולת, but some other word, which they render, *αλαστρια*. The Syr. has *mores*. Perhaps the word might be originally אורח, with the ו, as it is more correctly spelt. Where the Hebrew text has אורח, the Hebrew MSS have in many places אורח; for since the use of points the (י) and the (ו) are frequently omitted, and the cholem over the א detects the exclusion of the (ו). When the two words are compared, it will appear that such a mistake was not unlikely to happen, אורח:

אולת:

The difference between the ר and the ל is but little, especially if the ל be a little maimed at the top. The ח also is much like the ת. This correction will restore some sense. אורח, is frequently used to signify a man's "way of life, conversation," and thus will  
suit



suit both the version of the LXX and Syriac. Then the version of the passage will be :

“ But the way of fools is folly.”

The LXX read (1) before the first word, ἡ δὲ διατριβή; and so many MSS.

PROV. xvii. 21. “ He that begetteth a fool, (doth it) to his sorrow, and the father of a fool hath no joy.” This version is mere tautology, but not so the original, where the subjects spoken of are not, “ a fool—and a fool” but כסיל, and נבל, between which there was probably some difference. נבל had likely a stronger meaning than כסיל, and signified “ a vile flagitious fellow.” So it seems to mean 1 Sam. xxv. 25. where it seems synonymous to “ a man of Belial.” 2 Sam. xiii. 12, 13. where it is applied to the vilest of all crimes, rape and incest combined. See also Is. xxxii. 6. where the character of the Nabal is represented to us as very flagitious and abominable; and Jer. xxix. 23. The passage then might be turned thus :

“ He that begetteth a fool (begetteth him) to his sorrow ;

“ And the father of a flagitious person hath no joy.”

PROV. xix. 21. “ And a poor man is better than a liar.” So Heb. Here is no proper opposition; a poor man may be a liar, as well as another. Some characteristical epithets seem to be wanting here, which the LXX will supply, in whose version there is a just sentiment, and a proper opposition. Κρεῖσσον δὲ πτωχὸς δίκαιος ἢ πλεσιος ψευδῆς. They read עשיר and קרִי in their copy; “ And an upright poor man is better than a rich liar.”

PROV.

PROV. xxi. 6. "A vanity tossed to and fro of them that seek death." Perhaps, "the wind-tossed vanity," or, "a vanity liable to be blown away by the wind," transitory and fluctuating. We have נָדָה in the like sense, Lev. xxvi. 36. "The sound of a leaf shaken by the wind (נָדָה) shall drive them," or, "dispelled by the wind."

PROV. xxi. 8. "The way of man is froward, and strange, but as for the pure, his work is upright." The construction of this passage in the Hebrew is somewhat confused, and in the first clause there seems some distinguishing epithet wanting. But if we were only to omit the (ו) before וְ, which the LXX did not read, a proper sense will be restored;

"The way of a perverse man (אִישׁ וְ) is deceitful;" (הַסֵּפֶךְ, crooked, full of windings and turnings) "but as for the pure, his work is right" (the way of the well-intentioned man is שָׁרָה direct, open and honest.) Then the distinguishing epithet, which appears wanting in the first clause, will be restored. וְ undoubtedly implies here, "strange" in a moral meaning, as in Pf. lviii. 3. Hosea v. 7.

PROV. xxi. 12. "The righteous man wisely considereth the house of the wicked, but (God) overthroweth the wicked for their wickedness." This verse is very obscure, and perhaps defective. Our translators supply (God) in the last clause. Perhaps it is omitted in the first. The LXX read לבית for לבית, (καρδίας) which is probably right, and the ו before מִסֵּלָה, where it is wanted, καὶ φανύσθαι. Adopting these readings, and supplying the term, "God," in the first clause, we shall have a clear and consistent sense;

"The righteous (God) understandeth the hearts of the wicked;

"And

“And he overthroweth the wicked for their wickedness.”

Perhaps א following משיב might be dropped on account of the similarity of the sound between it, and the preceding syllable ב. This similarity has occasioned mistakes in other places.

PROV. xxii. 8. “He that soweth iniquity shall reap vanity, and the rod of his anger shall fail.” The word, “anger,” does not seem correspondent to the former clause. For עברותיו the LXX read עברותיו, *εργα αυτου*. According to which reading, the version will be; “He that soweth iniquity shall reap vanity; and the rod” (the divine curse, or chastisement) “shall consume his works.” Which renders this clause correspondent to the former, of his reaping vanity as the fruit of his sowing iniquity.

PROV. xxii. 21. “Answer to them that send thee.” Heb. לשלוחך. Perhaps לשאלך, “answer to them, that ask thee—” “Ask” seems more suited to the opposite term, “answer.” The LXX have προσεταξαμενοις σοι, *proponentibus tibi*, proposing or putting forth a question to thee, by which it should seem, that they read לשאלך.

PROV. xxiii. 35. “They have stricken me, (shalt thou say, and) I was not sick. They have beaten me, (and) I felt it not. When shall I awake? I will seek it yet again.” This version does not seem to be quite agreeable to the apparent design of the passage. The original seems to represent the excuse or apology of an habitual drunkard for his darling vice, and perhaps would be more properly rendered by way of question and answer in this manner, “Have they stricken me?” (as you say,) “I am not



not ill, or, the worse, for it. Have they beaten me? I felt it not. When shall I arise? I will seek it yet again." Here we have the representation of a sot, not allowing the arguments, which are set before him to convince him of his folly, as in our version, but disputing the truth, and reality of them; which is more natural for such an habitual sinner, who wanted to repeat his dose, and therefore would vindicate his folly at all events.

PROV. xxvi. 6. "Cutteth off the feet, and drinketh damage." The latter phrase seems to have no sense. If I might venture a conjecture, I would suppose, that חמץ שתה, was originally חמץ שתה. The words likely were much alike in sound, (which has occasioned some errors in other places, as one person might sometimes read, while another wrote). צין the LXX expresses by Σιν, צור by Σορ, and שדינים, by σιδονας, Judges xiv. 12. i. e. both צ, and ס, by the same letter Σ. The version then would be, "He that sendeth a message by a fool, (is like one who) cutteth off the feet," (i. e. of his messenger, and so prevents his going) "and drinketh vinegar," (instead of wine,) which will set his teeth on edge). What makes this conjecture the more probable to me, is, that חמץ, "vinegar," is used on a similar occasion, chap. x. 26.

"As vinegar to the teeth, and smoke to the eyes,  
"So is the sluggard to them that send him."

The sluggard here, and the fool above, seem to have much the same meaning. In both places, there is a similarity of sentiment, which makes it more likely that חמץ was used in both. As חמץ may be here written for חמץ, so חמץ seems to be written for חמץ, Ps. lxxi. 4, "צ and ס *inter se permutatis*," ait Buxtorf.

Buxtorf. Lex. in verbo. חָמָץ. So perhaps חָמָץ for חָמָץ, in lf. i. 17. As the LXX seem to have read, *ἐνοσθε ἀδικήσαντες*. These instances add something more of probability to the conjecture.

PROV. xxvi. 10. "The great (God) that formed all (things) both rewardeth the fool, and rewardeth transgressors." Such is our version in the text. In the margin, we have quite a different one. "A great (man) grieveth all, and he hireth the fool, he hireth also transgressors." Neither of these versions appear very intelligible. Nor is that of Junius and Tremellius more to be approved, as they insert words to make out some sense, which the original does not warrant. *Ut plurimum dolore afficit omnes (ebrius); ita mercedem dant (sibi) stolidus, etiam mercedem dat transeuntibus*. In short, few texts have puzzled the critics and commentators more than this. The Greek version however gives us a very different sense of the passage; Πολλὰ χιμαίνεται πασα σαξαρρω, ουτρεβεται γαρ η κλασις αυτων. This version indeed is not very clear, but sufficiently proves, that they read differently from the present text; perhaps nearly as under, which being compared with the present Hebrew the probability of the variations will be more apparent,

רַב מְחַלֵּל כָּל וְשָׂדֵה כָּסִיל וְשָׂדֵה עֲבָרִים. Present text, רַב מְחַלֵּל כָּל בָּשָׂר כָּסִיל וְשָׂדֵה עֲבָרִים. LXX read, which last may be translated different ways. 1st. As the LXX, "Every sort of fool is very tempestuous," (*i. e.* occasions much trouble) "but their wrath shall be broken." Or, "The fool greatly troubles every one, but their rage shall be broken," *i. e.* their rage and violence shall be repressed. The latter seems to me the more probable sense. The plural affix (as in עֲבָרִים,) is often used, though referring to a singular

singular antecedent, when that antecedent is of a general nature, as "the fool," "the wicked," singular, stand for fools and wicked men in general. What probability may be in this, I leave others to judge. This last version however has a clear meaning, which our present version and the Hebrew text itself have not.

PROV. xxvi. 23. "Burning lips, and a wicked heart." Heb.  $\text{לשון בועה}$ , perhaps  $\text{לשון פלה}$ , "flattering." So the LXX seem to have read by their  $\chi\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\ \alpha\iota\delta\alpha$ , *levia, blandientia labra*. "Flattering lips, and a wicked heart," are very agreeable to the simile here used, silver dross covering a potsherd.

PROV. xxix. 10. "The just seek his soul." Better, "care for his life."  $\text{ῥωπα}$  signifies "to seek solicitously," or, "to be concerned for," Pf. cxlii. 4.

PROV. xxix. 19. "A servant will not be corrected by words." The LXX have  $\sigma\iota\kappa\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \sigma\chi\lambda\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$ , "a stubborn servant," which is necessary to the sense.

PROV. xxx. 10. "Accuse not a servant to his master." Better perhaps, "Slander not. Do not calumniate." See Pf. ci. 5.

PROV. xxxi. 1. "The words of king Lemuel, the prophecy, that his mother taught him." But who was this king Lemuel? We find no mention of any such king any where else. I find commentators here greatly at a loss. Some would have it to be Solomon; but on no sufficient authority. Besides, here seems to be a plain contradiction. The discourse is intitled, "The words of king Lemuel,"

E e e

but



but in fact we find it to be the discourse of his mother to him. "What! my son! the son of my womb, &c." The Greek version hath not this name, nor the Arabic. May there not be a corruption in the text? I suspect it, and one easy to be accounted for: if instead of דברי למואל מלך "the words of king Lemuel," we read דברי אמו אל מלך "the words of his mother to the king," all will be consistent. The only change is in one letter, א for ל, and the א imperfectly written might be mistaken for ל. ל א might be more easily mistaken as making a part of the preceding word, as in the most antient copies, there was seldom any space left between the words. *Tota lex*, the Jews used to say, was *ut versus unus, & diffio una*. The repetition of, אמו, in the next clause is very agreeable to the Hebrew phraseology. The word Lemuel occurs again in the 4th verse, but neither does the Greek acknowledge it there, and it appears to me from the confusion of the words in that verse, that it is another corruption occasioned by the former. However that be, the former correction will stand good, as, in truth, the discourse is not king Lemuel's, or any other king's, but the discourse of his mother to the king, whoever that king might be.

N. B. Since I drew up this note I find, that Mr. Hallet, in his Notes, has called in question the genuineness of the word Lemuel, but he has offered no correction.

H. M.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

ALL that was originally intended in this inquiry  
was the proof of Christ being one of the human race,  
and to show that he incidentally speaks of his  
birth, before I came to this. Here, by accident, we  
obtain evidence for it, as it is contained in the original  
text of the New Testament, some might object, that  
it is only a thing of moment that may be objected to  
it, is related just as it happened. So that instead  
of an inference from one thing only, of our Lord,  
the matter is strengthened with an induction from all  
his other sayings, and this also of his apostles and  
contemporaries concerning him, which I have not now  
in the argument. It seems that some will be  
found to think that upon an important point, the  
evidence is not as strong as it is.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

*ALL* that was originally intended in this inquiry, was the proof of Christ being one of the human race, which results from what he incidentally speaks of his birth, before Pontius Pilate. How, by degrees, the intire evidence for it, as it lies scattered throughout the new Testament, came under consideration, together with every thing of moment that may be objected to it, is related just as it happened. So that instead of an inference from one saying only of our Lord's, the reader is presented with an induction from all his own sayings, and those also of his apostles and evangelists concerning him, which seemed of any weight in the argument. If what has been done shall be found to throw light upon an important subject, the labour will not have been lost.



**AN INQUIRY INTO THE EVIDENCE WHICH  
POINTS OUT CHRIST TO HAVE BEEN  
ONLY A CREATURE OF THE HUMAN  
RACE INVESTED WITH EXTRAORDINARY  
POWERS FROM GOD; AS IT ARISES FROM  
HIS OWN DECLARATIONS, AND THOSE  
OF HIS APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS.**

**C H A P. I.**

*Whether the testimony of Christ, John xviii. 37. does  
not furnish sufficient evidence, that he had no being  
before the time of his birth, viz. according to the  
common computation, 1786 years since.*

*John xviii. 37.—“To this end was I born, and for  
this cause came I into the world, that I might bear  
witness unto the truth.”*

I HAVE no doubt but that it has often occurred  
to many, that this declaration of our Lord's doth of  
itself furnish full and proper evidence of his actually  
being one of the human race, and holding himself  
forth merely as such to others, and that he did not  
belong to any other class of beings: but I do not  
recollect to have seen the proof drawn out at length.  
The

The following state of it is a candidate for admission into your commentaries.

In this reply and vindication of himself and his doctrine, which our Lord is here making, on his trial and examination before Pontius Pilate, the roman governor of Judea, he plainly declares, that he received his being and all his powers from God; and also the end and design for which they were bestowed upon him. With the latter our present disquisition meddleth not. Nor with the former, any further than to ascertain the beginning of Christ's existence, which seems here to be fixed by himself to the time of his birth, as recorded by two of the historians of his life.

It is then submitted to the unprejudiced thoughts of the reader; whether, in saying, *I was born*, our Lord does not signify, that when that event took place, he was first brought into being.

We should certainly so understand the words, if any other person was to say, *I was born*; that, at that time, whenever it was, he began to be. They cannot indeed properly admit of any other interpretation.

Nor can any other sense be put upon them, in the present instance, unless it should be found, that our Saviour himself any where taught the contrary; which does not appear from any fair construction of his sayings at any time. But as many assert the contrary, it is a point to be weighed and examined.

I HAVE no doubt but that it has often occurred to many, that this declaration of our Lord's birth is a full and proper evidence of his actually being one of the human race, and holding himself out as such to others, and that he did not belong to any other class of beings. I do not recollect to have seen the point drawn out as lengthily.

**CHAP.**

## C H A P. II.

AN INQUIRY INTO THOSE SAYINGS OF CHRIST, IN WHICH HE IS SUPPOSED TO CONTRADICT THE ABOVE ACCOUNT GIVEN OF HIMSELF, AND TO AFFIRM THAT HE HAD EXISTED BEFORE HE WAS BORN.

## SECTION I.

*Whether the phrase coming into the world, implies that Christ had actually come from another world into this. Where also of the phrases, coming forth from the Father, coming out from God, and the like.*

IT has been imagined, that our Lord, in the foregoing passage, at the very instant as it were, corrects himself, and signifies, that he does not take the term, *being born*, in its usual confined meaning, by what he immediately subjoins, *and for this cause came I into the world*; intimating as though, when born, he had only come out of another world into this. But it is an interpretation, which the language will not bear in this place (a).

For *coming into the world* is either synonymous to the being born; as when our evangelist, speaking of Christ, or the gospel, being an universal blessing, says, John i. 8. *That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world*; i. e. every man that is born.

Or, more commonly it will be found, however contrary to the idioms of our modern languages, that in our evangelist's writings, and in our Saviour's way of speaking, *coming into the world*, stands for  
having

(a) Dr. Doddridge, upon this passage, imposes his own idea upon our Saviour's words, in his paraphrase of them; making him to say, "for this end I came into the world from another and a much better abode;" which shews with what caution commentators and paraphrasts are to be read.



having an especial divine mission to men, to the world of mankind.

This may be made to appear in a variety of instances. 1. *To come into the world, and to be sent into the world*, are plainly expressions of the same import. This our Lord indicates in his prayer to the Father, for his apostles, a little before his death, addressing him thus; John xvii. 18. *As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world*; alleging his apostles to have been sent into the world equally with himself. And as he certainly did not intend hereby, that they had come from another world, where they had lived before they came into this, he cannot be understood to hint or assert any thing of the kind concerning himself. But agreeably to the occasion, and to his present purpose, he asserts both concerning himself and his chosen disciples; that, as he himself had his commission to preach the gospel, or *was sent immediately from God*, they had the like commission from God *mediately*, through him (b).

It hence follows, by this our Lord's own explanation of the phrase; that when in another place, he says, John iii. 17. *God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world*; by God's *sending his son into the world*, he meant nothing more, than his having an extraordinary divine commission, as a prophet and teacher, as the Christ.

2. We read, John viii. 42. *Jesus said unto them; I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me*. And in another place he says, xvi. 28; *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world*. In

(b) So it is said of John the Baptist, John i. 6. *There was a man sent from God, whose name was John*. No one hence concludes the Baptist to have come or to have been sent from another world into this; but only to have had a divine commission, to have been a prophet. The same construction therefore is to be put upon such phrases, when applied to Christ, when it is said of him, that he was sent from the Father, and the like.

In the former of these passages, our Lord explains himself the terms he uses; viz. that by *proceeding forth and coming from God*, he intended his being *sent from God*, or having an extraordinary divine mission. And in the latter, he signifies in the same way, that his *coming forth from the Father*, and *coming into the world*, were one and the same thing. Therefore coming into the world and being sent from God or having an extraordinary mission from him, are one and the same. *Quæ eidem æqualia, et inter se sunt æqualia.* It follows therefore demonstrably, by our Lord's own interpretation, that by his *coming forth from the Father*, and *coming into the world* he intended nothing more than his having an especial commission from God. And it follows hence likewise, that we have the authority of Christ himself to interpret his language in the same manner, wherever he speaks of his *coming down from heaven*; that it is not to be understood literally, but thereby he only means his divine commission to preach the gospel. For the phrases *coming down from heaven*, *coming into the world*, *coming forth from the Father*, are plainly of the same signification.

The whole sentence of this last citation runs thus: *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world and go to the Father.* And it may perhaps be objected to the interpretation now given, that because in the latter clause, *leaving the world* is taken in its literal sense, therefore the former of *coming into the world* is also to be taken literally, of Christ's coming from another world into this.

But this by no means follows. For it is frequent with the best authors, and the sacred writers in particular, when the same words are put in opposition to each other, to take the one in a literal, the  
F f f
other

other in a figurative sense. Thus Matth. viii. 22. Christ saith; *let the dead bury their dead*; i. e. those who are *spiritually* dead bury those who are *actually* dead. And 1 Thess. v. 4. 5. 7. 8. the terms *day*, *night*, are contrasted, and now put for the time the sun is above or under the horizon, now again to be taken in a figurative sense, for wisdom and virtue, or the loss of them.

3. We read, John vi. 14. *Then those men, when they had seen the miracles that Jesus did, i. e. of feeding five thousand people with five barley loaves and two small fishes; said, this is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world*; i. e. the prophet, that was to have an especial divine commission, the Christ: for so it hence appears the phrase, *coming into the world*, was commonly understood by the Jewish people, since they never expected their Messiah to be any other than one of their own countrymen. And so Martha, the sister of Lazarus, replied to our Saviour, John xi. 27. *I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world*; i. e. whom they expected to have an especial divine commission. And so John xli. 46. *I am come a light into the world*; in other and plainer words, "I have a divine commission to teach mankind." (c)

Since

(c) Sometimes, for brevity sake, the term, *to come* is used by itself. Matth. xi. 18, 19. *John came neither eating nor drinking: the Son of Man came eating and drinking*: i. e. John was a prophet of austere, reserved manners; Jesus of a more social communicative character. John i. 7. *John came for a witness, to bear witness of the light, that all men might believe*. i. e. John had a divine mission to qualify him to bear testimony to Jesus as the Messiah. viii. 14. *I know whence I came, and whither I go: but ye cannot tell whence I come and whither I go*. i. e. I have the fullest conviction of the truth of my divine mission, and have given you the strongest evidences of it; but your worldly prejudices hinder you from seeing them.



Since the writing of the above, I have met with a remark of Dr. Hammond, in his annotations on John i. 9. so full to the purpose of what I have advanced concerning the true interpretation of the phrase, *coming into the world*, when applied to Christ; that I shall here transcribe it.

After some reasons assigned for translating the passage, not as I have cited it, and as it stands in our common english version: but, *This was the true light, which, coming into the world Christ lighteneth every man*; and supposing Christ to be the *light* here intended by the sacred writer, and spoken of as *coming into the world*, he says; "Here it is to be observed, that this *coming into the world*, doth not refer to *Christ's* birth in the world, but to the manifestation of him to the world, his entering on his office of preaching the will of God to them. So as his *coming* may be all one with his being sent, that is, his commission from God to declare his will unto the world, as John viii. 42. *I came not of myself, but he sent me.* So chap. xviii. 37. *For this was I born, and for this I came into the world*; where, as *coming into the world* differs from *birth*, so it is in the next words specified what it peculiarly belongs to, *I came into the world that I may bear witness to the truth.* Thus it is used in the other word (*sent*) of the apostles, where it cannot possibly be understood of their *birth*, John xvii. 18. *As thou hast sent me into the world, so also have I sent them into the world.* So 1 Tim. i. 15. *Jesus Christ came into the world*; and John xi. 27. *I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God,* ο υις του κυριου ερχομενος, *that cometh into the world*; which was certainly designed by *Martha* as an expression of her belief that he was the *Messias.*"

This proof, arising from our Saviour's own declaration,

claration, that he was born or had a beginning of existence, like all others of the human species, will be main and imperfect, if no solution be offered of other contrary declarations, which are supposed to be made by him, in the writings of our evangelist. I shall therefore endeavour to give some account of such of them as seem to be of any weight. And although the preface to St. John's gospel containeth not any saying of Christ, but a remark which the writer, one of his apostles, thought proper to prefix to his history of Christ; yet it is so much reckoned upon as a proof of Christ's preexistence, and even of his being the eternal God, that I shall be excused stepping a little out of the way to inquire into its true meaning, as also into the Baptist's testimony to Christ included in it.

## SECTION II.

*Whether the beginning of St. John's gospel affords a proof of Christ's preexistence.*

1. It has been maintained by many, that the same Jesus, who in this defence of himself before Pontius Pilate, referred to his being born, and thereby gave an idea of his considering himself as a human being, like those before whom he was speaking; was nevertheless the *Logos*, *Word* or *Wisdom*, characterised by our evangelist in the preface to his gospel, as being God, by whom all things were made.

*In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. And so on.*

But that St. John could not intend what he there speaks to be understood of Jesus Christ; either that he was the eternal God, as is commonly interpreted; or a God, an inferior God, the creator of the universe  
under

under the Supreme, as Dr. Clarke, and those christians, called Arians, affirm; is evident for these two principal among other reasons.

(1.) Our evangelist never afterwards throughout this whole work, speaks of Jesus under this name; nor describes him, either as the eternal God, or as the subordinate creator of all things employed by him: But, on the contrary, he continually considers and speaks of him as a man, who received his being and all his powers from God: from HIM whom he always called *his father*, that is, the author of his being; one subject to the like infirmities with other men, hungry, faint, &c. and who as he was born, or began to be, so he died, or ceased to be; losing all sense and thought at death, till it pleased God to restore him to life on the third day. Now, these are things which can only be predicated of, and belong to a creature, and as far as we know, belong only to human creatures, such as we ourselves are.

(2.) As our evangelist never once intimates that Jesus was either the self-existent creator of all things, or the instrument of God in the creation who had existed before all ages: it happens also that this favourite disciple of Christ, himself informs us, that it was a thing quite beside his design to assert any thing of the kind concerning his divine master; that so far from intending it, the highest idea and character which he proposed to verify and establish concerning him was; that he was the great promised prophet, and messenger of God, whom their nation expected: For towards the close of his work, he says, John xx. 30, 31. *Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through his name.*

Those



Those therefore, who from the preface to St. John's gospel would prove Christ to be God; or, to be, as Dr. Clarke would have it, and expresses himself, "a Divine Person, who existed before the creation of the world, before all ages; by whom God created all things;" they assert much more than the evangelist either designed, or appears to have had any knowlege of, concerning his divine master.

The other interpretations then, which have been given of this introduction to his gospel, prefixed by the apostle, are much more likely to be true; and particularly that, which seems to have been held from the first, by those who took the sacred writings for their guide, and not the false philosophy of the times; viz. that by the *Logos*, the *Word* (which might likewise be translated *Wisdom*, *Reason*,) we are to understand the all-powerful wisdom or energy of God, which is God himself; by which all things were made; and which was in a large measure communicated to Jesus Christ; and therefore might be said to dwell or reside in him: which is that which St. John intends, where he says, near the conclusion of his preface; (i. 14.) *The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, &c.*

### SECTION iii.

*Whether John i. 15. affords a proof of Christ's pre-existence.*

John i. 15. "He that cometh after me, is preferred before me: for he was before me."

This is John the Baptist's testimony to Christ, delivered in his prophetic character; see ver. 27. 30. And

And as such, there is a peculiar emphasis in the word, *ερχομενος*, *cometh*, denoting our Lord's divine mission, as was pointed out above in explaining the meaning of the term *cometh*, to *come*, in prophetic language.

The Baptist is here accounting to the Jewish rulers and people, why he himself, who was an older prophet and had his commission before Christ, was nevertheless inferior, and to give way to him; and he alleges, that this was not, as some suppose, because Christ was prior in time to him, having existed before all ages; but because he was more excellent in dignity and office. This will be seen to be the meaning of what John here declares concerning him.

*He that cometh after me*, says he, *i. e.* whose commission from God is subsequent to mine, *is preferred before me*: our translators have inserted the word *preferred*, to shew what is intended by the term, *εμπροσθεν*, before me, *i. e.* takes place of me: *for*, proceeds the Baptist, *he was before me*. This should have been Englished, *for he was* (d) *my chief, my principal*; or, *for he was* (e) *more excellent than me*; one or other of which constructions the words in the original naturally lead to, and the other sense would never have been adopted

(d) *πρωτος* *μου*, my chief, my principal, is a construction that continually occurs in the New Testament, as Mark vi. 21. *πρωτοι της Γαλιλαιας*, the principal men of Galilee, &c. And Glassius acknowledges this to be a proper sense of the words, though he gives the other, as implying Christ's eternal existence, a doctrine which he studiously brings in wherever he can, and with passion and harsh words reprobates the contrary opinion. Sunt autem, says he, qui *πρωτος*, h. l. per *principem* convertunt, uti accipitur Marc. vi. vers. 21. Luc. xix. vers. 47. Act. xxv. vers. 2. sensu hoc: quia princeps meus erat. Philol. Sacr. p. 274.

(e) The words *πρωτος*, *πρωτιστος*, are frequently put for priority in dignity or excellence. See instances in Grotius, and other commentators.

adopted, if our translators had not been prepossessed, that Christ had existed (f) before all ages, and therefore gave that turn to the words. It is under the influence of this prejudice, that Dr. Doddridge, after others, gives the following paraphrase of the words in question, making the Baptist to say; "for though indeed as to his human birth he is younger than me, and did not come into the world till a little after me, yet in a much more noble and exalted kind of being *he existed long before me*, or even before the production of any creature whatsoever." And he endeavours to vindicate this paraphrase by what he imagines to be similar language (g) of the Baptist; but which indeed means quite another thing. But if these simple words of this forerunner of Christ had contained such a recondite meaning, and extraordinary discovery concerning him; that though he appeared as a man, he was a being who had existed before all ages; how comes it, that we never once afterwards find the Jewish people or any of John's disciples, speak of such an extraordinary thing?

(f) The three other evangelists thus give us the Baptist's declaration concerning Christ; which shews that they did not understand him to refer to any prior existence of Christ, but to his superior character and dignity. Matth. iii. 11. *He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear.* Mar. i. 7. *There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose.* Luke iii. 16. *One mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose.*

(g) John iii. 31. *He that cometh from above, is above all: he that is of the earth, is earthly, and speaketh of the earth; he that cometh from heaven is above all.* But it has been shewn above, from our Saviour's own explication of such language, that his *coming from above, coming from heaven*, is expressive only of his having a divine extraordinary commission, and has nothing to do with any state of glory, in which Dr. Doddridge supposes him to have existed before his incarnation, as he calls it.



thing? was it not likely to have impressed them more than any thing else concerning Christ. This testimony was also given him, at the very entrance of his public ministry; and by John, whom all revered as a prophet; and yet we find no one ever to have taken any notice of it, or to have considered Jesus, as a great preexistent being, or indeed as any thing else than a human creature, belonging to one of their tribes, and born among them. This circumstance alone, even if the plain import of the words was not against it, might make us hesitate in adopting any such meaning of the Baptist's words. Dr. Clarke's superior critical skill would not let him give any other interpretation of them than what I have assigned, though it is well known which way his own opinion leaned. He thus paraphrases this fifteenth verse. "John the Baptist, though the greatest prophet that ever appeared among the Jews, yet was only the forerunner of our Lord: being sent to prepare the way before him. And so far was John from assuming to himself any thing more than this, that he constantly upon all occasions abased himself, and exalted Jesus: professing to the people, before he had seen Jesus, that they must expect there would shortly appear a person of *infinitely greater excellence and authority* than himself." L'Enfant leaves no ambiguity in his translation of the passage; "C'est ici celui duquel j'ai dit: celui qui vient après m'est préféré, parce qu'il est *plus grand* que moi." And to have done justice to the English reader, our version should have been; for he was *greater* than me, or, *my chief*.

## SECTION IV.

*Whether John iii. 13. affords a proof of Christ having had a prior existence in heaven.*

"No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." John iii. 13.

It has been often proved, from the like use of the same ways of speaking in other parts of Scripture, and from our Lord's design in this place; that what he intended in speaking of *himself alone having ascended into heaven*, was, that no one but himself was acquainted with the divine will and councils respecting the salvation of mankind. I shall not therefore here offer any thing after others; but would only refer the learned reader to *Raphelius* the son, in his preface to his father's annotations on the Scriptures, where he has demonstrated this point, as far as such a matter is capable of it; and given several pleasing illustrations of it from other writers. And his testimony is the more remarkable, as he seems to be of what is called the orthodox opinion concerning Christ. Among others he quotes *Vatable*, the learned Paris-Professor of Hebrew at the time of the Reformation, Erasmus, and Grotius, as giving the same interpretation of this language of Christ with himself. But although he so solidly establishes the meaning of the first clause in this sentence, that it is not to be literally understood, he is mistaken in taking the second clause [*but he that came down from heaven*] in the literal sense of Christ's coming down from heaven to earth. For we have seen above, (p. 395.) from our Lord's explanation of his own language, that all that he would convey by such language, as *coming forth from the Father, coming down*  
from

from heaven, coming into the world, was nothing more than that he had a divine commission to teach mankind. And Christ's meaning in this place, agreeably with Vatable's exposition of it, *Nemo novit res celestes præter me*; may thus in other words be expressed; *No one understands the things of God, but myself, who am commissioned by Almighty God to reveal them to the world.*

#### SECTION V.

*Whether Christ's language, John vi. affords a proof, that he had lived in heaven before he was born.*

It is by the same rule and method, that we are to interpret the highly figurative language which our Lord purposely makes use of in this chapter, to discourage certain of the Jews from his company who followed him merely out of worldly views, taking occasion from the miracle he had lately wrought among them, and their contrasting it with the *manna*, the bread from heaven, with which their forefathers were miraculously fed in the wilderness, to characterize his doctrine, as *bread coming down from heaven*, and himself as also *coming down from heaven* and giving it men to eat. (h)

John vi. 32, 33.—*My Father, saith he, giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.—50, 51. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from*

(b) In the same sense, in which our Saviour styles his own doctrine, *bread that came down from heaven*, because he taught it by authority from God: he also speaks of the baptism of John as *coming from heaven*, because the Baptist therein acted by divine authority. Matth. xxi. 25.



from heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. 53. Verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

It is observable here, that our Lord still as he goes on, uses harsher metaphors, with a view to disgust such troublesome guests and discourage them from adjoining themselves to him. First, he calls his doctrine, which he taught by divine authority, and which would bring eternal life to such as obeyed it, *the bread of God which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world*. Next, he says, *the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world*; signifying thereby, that he was to seal the truth of his doctrine by dying or shedding his blood in attestation of it; and then at last, he conveys the same idea in still more revolting terms, that they were to *eat his flesh and drink his blood*.

Therefore throughout this whole discourse, and wherever else our Saviour speaks of any thing, or of himself, as *coming down from heaven*, we have his own sanction and example, as proved above, for its signifying no more than its being of, or his having a divine authority.

#### SECTION VI.

Whether John vi. 62. implieth Christ's existence in another state, before he came into this.

John vi. 62. "What and if ye shall see the son of man ascend up where he was before?"

This is a continuation of the discourse above-cited. And as we have had an opportunity of shewing,

ing, that therein, by using such language as his *coming down from heaven*, which in the literal sense might imply his preexistence; yet, Christ himself being the interpreter, nothing of the kind was intended; it is not therefore to be imagined, that he would teach any thing of the kind by such a dark intimation as this before us, and especially when one clause of it in its literal sense could not be true: for at the time, the *Son of man* had never been in heaven, although the words seem to affirm it; unless we are to believe the chimera of Socinus and some of his followers, that Christ had literally been taken up thither after his baptism, to be instructed in the things relating to his divine mission.

Much of the perplexity about this text has arisen from its being supposed to contain something very mysterious and important about our Lord's person and character without any ground for it. Some will be pleased to see Dr. Lardner's thoughts upon it, in a letter to a learned and worthy (i) person, with whom that excellent man had a friendly correspondence, and who has obligingly favoured me with the communication and leave to publish them. The letter is dated Jan. 21. 1764.

"As for John vi. 62. I would refer you to Grotius. I think we must not understand our Lord there too literally. For we are not thence to conclude, that our Lord's body came down from heaven. Nor are we to suppose, that many or most of those, to whom he was then speaking, would

(i) The Reverend Mr. Wiche, of Maidstone, Kent. To whom we are indebted for the publication of those valuable posthumous Discourses of Dr. Lardner, intitled "Two schemes of a Trinity considered, and the Divine Unity asserted in four Discourses upon Philip. ii. 5-11." By J. Johnson, St Paul's Charchyard, 1784.

"would see him ascend to heaven. I have been apt  
 "to think, that thereby our Lord intended only to  
 "say, that he should not be always personally here,  
 "but should leave this world; which was the most  
 "discouraging thought to all the carnal jews, and  
 "much suited to his purpose on the present occasion.  
 "If you please, you may consult my second Volume  
 "of Sermons, p. 188, &c. It is observable, that  
 "our Lord says, John xvi. 5. *I go my way to him*  
 "*that sent me*; and vii. 93. *And then I go to him*  
 "*that sent me*. He seems designedly to avoid the  
 "word *return*. But here, at this last text, Dr.  
 "Doddridge has hastily and incautiously used the  
 "word *return*, *And then I am to return to him*  
 "*that sent me*."

#### SECTION VII.

*Whether John viii. 58. be a proof of Christ's existence  
 from all eternity.*

John viii. 58. *"Jesus said unto them; verily, ve-  
 rily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am."*

It will be easily perceived by an unprejudiced  
 reader, that our Lord does not here refer to his  
 having *actually* had a being before Abraham, but to  
*that being* which he may as it were, *be said* to have  
 had, by having been destined in the divine councils  
 from the beginning for the important character he  
 was to sustain, and having his birth foretold to that  
 patriarch, as of one who was to be an extraordinary  
 blessing to Abraham's family, and to the whole  
 world of mankind. Gen. xxii. 17. 18.

This will be seen from the connection of the pas-  
 sage; which is as follows—ver. 12, *Then spake*  
*Jesus*



Jesus again unto them, saying, *I am the light of the world: &c.* Our Lord here plainly declares himself to be the Messiah, in the language of their old prophets concerning him, before he was born, particularly Isaiah. The Pharisees who were blinded by prejudice, and determined not to acknowledge him in that character, proceed to wrangle and dispute with him upon it; but he calmly confutes their vain cavil, yet with severe rebukes all along for the bad dispositions they discovered in their opposition to him. At last,

ver. 27. They constrained him to say; *if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.* There is a word left out in the original, to be supplied by the reader, a thing not uncommon in all good writers. Our translators have inserted *be*, and our Lord undoubtedly referred to what he had said at the beginning, and was continually inculcating, that he was *the Christ, the Messiah.* Dr. Hammond's paraphrase is, *"if ye believe not that I am the Messiah ye shall lose the benefit that I came to bring you, &c."*

ver. 28. We have the same way of speaking again. *Then Jesus said unto them, when ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that, &c.*

Dr. Hammond again paraphrases the latter clause; *"then shall ye be convinced that I am the Messiah, and came from God, and do nothing but according to my commission from him."*

In the progress of the conversation with these Pharisees, their temper still continuing the same, toward the close of it, upon their highly extolling Abraham, and Christ telling them, that this their great ancestor had some distant glimpse of himself, who

was to be one of his descendants in future time; when in their anger, they gave a turn to his words, as if he had asserted that he was cotemporary with Abraham; not thinking it worth the while to confute such an absurd construction of his words, which only shewed how incurably they were bent against him, our Lord persists in what he had alleged before; viz.

Ver. 38. *Jesus said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you: Before Abraham was, I am.*

Now to have been consistent with themselves, and to have done justice to the english reader, as the matter in dispute between our Lord and these men was not changed, and the very same words made use of, our translators should have rendered them in the same manner, and should have put it, *Before Abraham was, I am he*, as they had done in ver. 24, 28, preceding. This would have left the true meaning of the passage more open to ordinary inquirers.

Grotius has explained this text in a few words, in his wonted admirable way; (A) that Jesus might say, "Before Abraham existed, I am the Messiah; because he was such even then in Abraham's days, by the divine foreknowledge and appointment; in the same manner as he afterwards (John xvii. 5.) prayed for the glory which he had, i. e. had it, (because it was designed for him in the divine mind) before the world was: And, as he is said to be (Rev. xiii. 8.) the lamb slain before the foundation of the world, although actually put to death in the reign of Tiberius; and 1 Pet. i. 20. to have been  
(A) *ἐγὼ αὖτις, id est, eram: Præsens pro imperfecto. Fuerat ante Abrahamum Jesus divina constitutione, infra xvii. 5 Apoc. xiii. 8. 1 Pet. i. 20.*

"been *foreordained before the foundation of the world*," long before he was born, or had any "actual existence."

Did we not daily experience the power of prejudice to darken our understandings, and hinder us from seeing the most palpable contradictions, one might be surprised that any could ever suppose our Lord to be so very open and familiar with these Pharisees, his most bitter adversaries, as to tell them such a *wonderful secret* concerning himself, that he was the I AM, *Jehovah, the eternal God*, as some construe his words; or according to others, that he had existed with God from the beginning, before the world was; at the same time that, so far from being explicit upon the subject, he kept his disciples, as we have seen, and will still more appear, quite in the dark about a thing so prodigious and extraordinary; never giving them grounds to consider him as any thing more than a human being, raised up for extraordinary purposes of divine providence, and invested with high powers from God for the execution of them.

#### SECTION viii.

*Whether John xiii. 3. be a proof of Christ having existed in another world with God, before he was born here.*

John xiii. 3. "*Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God,*" &c.

It hath been abundantly shewn above, that similar language to this, when used by Christ himself, has no relation to any prior state in which he had lived

H h h

before



before his birth upon earth: but that to *come from God*, is to have a commission from him, as his prophet or messenger (d).

#### SECTION ix.

*Whether John xvii. 5. be a proof of Christ having existed with the Father before all ages.*

John xvii. 5. "*And now, o Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was!*"

So long as persons will not search into the real intent and meaning of what they read, but form their judgments from expressions separately taken, and unconnected with the circumstances, scope and design of the writer or speaker, they must be liable to be imposed upon and misled by the sound of such passages as this in our Lord's prayer to God, and greatly mistake his person and true character. For looking merely at the words themselves, they do certainly seem to imply the sense which a late popular expositor puts upon them; viz. "*And now therefore, o my heavenly Father, do thou glorify me with thine own self with the original glory, which I had with thee before the world was created, and which for the salvation of men I have for a while laid aside, that I might clothe myself in this humble form.*" Doddridge *in loc.*

But a due consideration of what Christ himself teaches concerning the *glory* for which he here prays, would have helped to correct such a misrepresentation

(d) How Christ's coming from God is to be understood in a figurative sense, and his going to God more literally; see above p. 395. 396.

representation of it, as this *exposition* of the text conveys. For a very few days only before our Lord uttered this prayer, when *certain Greeks*, or devout gentiles, who had come up to worship the true God at Jerusalem, desired to have access to him, we are told that he broke out into this joyful exclamation, John xii. 23, 24. *Jesus answered them; the hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.* Although fully sensible that his own violent death must lead the way to it, he rejoices at the near prospect of his being glorified, that is, of attaining the glory he aimed at, in the heathen world being brought to the knowledge of the truth, and to eternal life, by the preaching of his gospel; for so the occasion plainly leads us to understand his words. The glory of Christ therefore, from this his own account of it was, that by the effectual propagation of the gospel, he might be made the happy instrument of the salvation of mankind.

That this is the true idea of the glory, for which Christ made now his supplication to the Almighty Father, is confirmed by what he goes on to say in his prayer, of his having promised to his disciples, that they should be sharers with him in it; ver. 22. *And the glory, which thou hast given me, I have given them: that they may be one, as we are one.*

For there was no other glory in common with Christ and his apostles, or which was likely to occur to his mind at that time, but what related to the success of the gospel, which he was sending them forth to propagate over the whole earth. And the same manner of expression with respect to himself as well as them, points to this glory as something not yet actually enjoyed either by him  
or

or them, but only certainly to be expected; *the glory*, says he, *which thou hast given me*, I have given them: he had not actually given it them, for they were not in the possession of it, but he had given them an absolute promise of it, as God had given to him; that they, no less than himself, should have the honour of contributing to the virtue and everlasting happiness of all men by the gospel: Christ, its first preacher; they, his disciples, after him, and as instructed and deputed by him.

### CHAPTER III.

WHETHER THE WAY IN WHICH CHRIST SPEAKS OF HIMSELF, AND OF HIS RELATION TO HIS APOSTLES AND TO GOD THE COMMON FATHER OF ALL, John viii. 39, 40. and xx. 17. DO NOT DENOMINATE HIM ONE OF THE HUMAN RACE.

Either of these declarations, by itself, is no less conclusive for our Saviour being one of our kind, than that which gave occasion to our present inquiry, *viz.* his incidental mention of his birth before the Roman Governor; and such sayings, and records of him, shew, what kind of being, what person, this evangelist took his divine Master to be; as also what Christ thought of himself, and would have others to think of him.

In the first of these passages, John viii. 39, 40. *Jesus saith unto them; if ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man, who hath told you the truth, &c.*

We can argue and conclude nothing else from this language; nor could they that heard it; but that he, who so speaks of himself, was a human creature, one of our own species. His being of any



any other higher class of creatures, or the eternal God, is absolutely precluded by the very term, *man*, and the connection in which it stands.

In the second—xx. 17. *Jesus saith unto her;—go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God.*

This is our Lord's message to his apostles, by Mary Magdalene, to whom he first made himself known, after he had been raised from the dead. And it would be difficult to find words, that could more plainly express, that Christ really was, and that he desired to be considered in no other light, than as one of the human species. For in saying simply and naturally, that he had the same God and Father with his apostles, he acknowledges himself to have had his being from God, and to be a creature, as they were. And in styling them his *brethren*, he owns himself a jew, like them, and one of Abraham's descendants, or sprung alike from Adam, the first father of our race.

There is this farther to be observed in these testimonials of Christ concerning his nature and condition of being; that they are expressions casually dropt from him, in the course of conversation, without any design of indicating any thing particular by them, or that any particular notice should be taken of them; and it is merely the long inveterate error of his followers about his person, that obliges us to seek out and produce them. For our Lord never appears in any degree to have had a thought, that mankind would take him to be any other than a human being, least of all, to be the eternal God; and therefore he never uses any precautions to obviate or guard against such strange eccentric imaginations.

COROLLARY.

## COROLLARY.

Thus have we seen, from the examination of a long list of passages in our evangelist St. John's history of Christ, that nothing spoken by our Lord, or recorded concerning him by this apostle, stands in the least contradiction to his intimation concerning himself, before Pontius Pilate, that he had a beginning of his existence, like all others of the human species: but on the contrary, the whole account is consistent, and confirms it. And we have seen also two other direct affirmations of our Lord to the same amount, concerning himself. We are therefore compelled by unsurmountable evidence to conclude, that this apostle looked upon his master Jesus in this light only, as one of the human race; at the same time that he revered him for his extraordinary gifts of a divine power and wisdom, for his high office and commission from Almighty God, and eminent virtues and benevolence in the fulfilment of it.

CHAP.

## CHAPTER IV.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE SAYINGS OF CHRIST RECORDED BY THE OTHER EVANGELISTS; AND THE TESTIMONIES OF THOSE OTHER EVANGELISTS CONCERNING HIM IN THEIR RESPECTIVE HISTORIES: HOW FAR THEY AGREE WITH THE FOREGOING CONCLUSION DRAWN FROM ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL; WHICH WAS, THAT CHRIST THERE UNIFORMLY SPEAKS OF HIMSELF AS ONE ALTOGETHER OF THE HUMAN SPECIES, AND IS INVARIABLY SO CHARACTERIZED BY THAT HIS HISTORIAN AND FAVOURITE DISCIPLE.

## SECTION I.

*Whether it may be deduced, that Christ was intirely one of the human species, from his own declarations contained in St. Matthew's gospel, and from the sentiments apparently held concerning him by that evangelist.*

To compleat our argument, it will become us next to examine; whether the other evangelists, who have also drawn up histories of our Saviour, have made mention of any thing said by him, which might give reason in any shape to think, that he esteemed himself any other than a human being; or whether these sacred writers themselves appear to have entertained any other persuasion concerning their divine master.

Now on opening first the memoirs of Matthew, one of our Lord's apostles and constant attendants, we find him, in the beginning, mentioning the pedigree, parentage and birth of Jesus; relating indeed some-



something extraordinary concerning the last, but nothing that betokened him to be any other than one of the human race; unless we should say, that Adam was not properly a man, because he was not born in the ordinary way of his descendants, but produced immediately by the hand of God. In the progress of his narrative, he describes the same Jesus, as a great prophet, remarkably owned by Almighty God, and honoured and distinguished with divine gifts and powers above all others of the human race, but nothing that marked him out to be otherwise at all different from them; living, and conversing, and at last suffering pain and dying, in the same way with all others of mankind. And as he never brings him in uttering a word, that might be construed, as if he thought himself any other than a human creature; there are two of his sayings in particular recorded by this evangelist, which so naturally confirm this idea of our Lord, which his whole book holds forth, that they may not be omitted.

1. In that beautiful description of the day of judgment, chap. xxv. contrived and calculated particularly for the encouragement of his apostles, whom he was sending into the wide world, to preach the gospel, friendless and unsupported; he thus introduces and describes himself, ver. 40. *And the king shall answer and say unto them; verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.*

2. The day of his resurrection, on his sudden appearance to some of his followers, we read; xxviii. 10. *Then said Jesus unto them; be not afraid: go tell my brethren, that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me.*

Christ here declares, that at the day of judgment, he

he shall not look upon himself as any other than one of the human race; for he says, that he shall then own his true followers as *his* brethren, i. e. his brethren of mankind. And he uses the same language after his resurrection, in speaking of the relation between him and his apostles. Our Lord then does himself authorize us now to consider him as *our brother*, however highly and justly exalted above us; as one of our brethren of mankind. But is this compatible, could we use such familiar language with a great preexistent spirit, that had existed before all ages; or with the eternal God himself?

#### SECTION ii.

*Whether it may be deduced from Christ's own declarations in Mark's gospel, and from what is related of him by that evangelist, that our Saviour was altogether one of human kind.*

MARK, a relation of Barnabas, and an attendant upon and fellow labourer with the apostles, in his account of Christ, waving any mention of his birth and family, begins his gospel with our Lord's entrance on his public ministry. But although this evangelist says nothing of his birth; yet he tells us, in the course of his history, vi. 3. that Jesus was *the Son of Mary*; and like the other evangelists, he brings in our Lord commonly styling himself *the Son of man*; indicating thereby who he was, and what he would have all men think of him; and never giving the least intimation that he belonged to any other class of beings than that of mankind. In all other points, except some few circumstances not very material, but which may seem to bespeak him an original writer, and not a copyer, he agrees with Matthew; and moreover records nothing at any time uttered by Christ, that shewed as if he

esteemed himself of a different nature from other men; nor does our evangelist ever intimate that he himself had any such thought concerning him. I shall cite one passage; but it is most decisive.

*And he went out from thence, and came into his own country. And when the Sabbath-day was come, he began to teach in the synagogue. And many, hearing him, were astonished, saying; from whence hath this man these things? and what wisdom is this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands? Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James and Joses, and of Juda and Simon? and are not his sisters with us? And they were offended at him. But Jesus said, a prophet is not without honour, but in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house.* Mark vi. 1.

In this reflection upon the behaviour of his countrymen, our Lord owns his family and relations to have been of the town of Nazareth, and thereby plainly signifies himself to have been of the same nature with them, and nothing different from his kindred in that respect. In this light also it is plain that our evangelist considers Christ, by writing down and informing us of these things concerning him, and by never inserting one syllable, that might give cause to suspect, that he took him to be any other than the Son of Mary.

### SECTION iii.

*Whether it may be deduced from any declarations of Christ in Luke's gospel, or from what is related of him by that evangelist, that our Saviour was intirely one of the human species.*

LUKE, the evangelist, was a companion of the apostle Paul in his travels to preach the gospel;  
was



was certainly a very early believer; if he was not also a disciple of Christ himself, as some have conjectured, and one of those to whom Christ made himself known, the very day of his resurrection.

In the beginning of his history of Christ, after mentioning some extraordinary circumstances preceding his birth, he describes him brought into the world, in the manner in which we all are, in a state of helpless infancy; wherein his powers, capacities and dispositions were of course left to be drawn out and formed by his mother and the persons about him, like those of all other children. And our historian afterwards relates, (ii. 52.) that *Jesus increased in wisdom with his years, and in favour with God and man.* This is the gradual progressive state of a human creature.

St. Luke, in common with the other evangelists, introduces our Lord frequently styling himself, *the Son of man*: which sufficiently declares Christ's sentiments of his own condition, and what he would have others take them to be.

After a long narrative of our Lord's laborious life, spent in teaching men true piety and virtue, he represents him near the close of it, under dread and dismay upon the keen foresight of the torturing ignominious death he was about to undergo, but relieved under his apprehensions by application to God in prayer, for his assistance; and at last, worn out with fatigue and pain, expiring like other men in the like circumstances. These again are things that belong to feeble mortals.

Our evangelist tells us, that the Jews who honoured Jesus the most, stiled him a *great prophet*, and that as such his disciples, in his life-time, looked upon him and spoke of him. Thus after he had  
restored

restored to life the widow of Nain's son, we are told, Luke vii. 16. that *there came a fear on all; and they glorified God, saying, that a great prophet is risen up among us.* And one of the disciples, to whom he appeared after his resurrection, calls him, *Jesus of Nazareth, a prophet mighty in deed and word, before God and all the people,* xxiv. 19.

Thus we see the sentiments which this evangelist entertained of our Saviour, and sought to inculcate and teach mankind, in his account of him. It is plain he regarded him only as one of the human race, with high powers from God. And shall we not be content with the testimony and account of one, who, if he was not one of Christ's seventy disciples himself, conversed with his apostles, and was a constant companion of St. Paul; with whom also he intirely agrees, however some deem the contrary?

#### SECTION IV.

*Whether it is to be deduced, that Christ was only a human being, from his apostles' manner of preaching and speaking of him, in St. Luke's second treatise, called THE ACTS.*

But we have not done with St. Luke. For this is only his testimony, which he gave, in what he calls (Acts i. 1.) his *former treatise of all that Jesus began both to do and to teach.* In his second treatise, which is a continuation of the former, and contains an account of the preaching of the gospel to Jews and Gentiles after Christ's resurrection, improperly called *The Acts of the Apostles*, when it speaks only of the actions of a few of them; here his testimony is still more important; as he alone informs us, in what terms,

terms, and, after what manner the apostles spoke of their divine master, when they invited the world upon their evidence to believe in him; and as he only carries on the thread of the gospel-history to near the time (Acts xxviii. 30. 31.) of the death of the apostle Paul; without which we must have been utterly in the dark about many things of the greatest moment.

Hence then we may expect to learn, with the utmost precision and exactness, if any one should have any doubts remaining; after what has been produced above, who Jesus was? For his apostles speak of him, not when upon earth, but when taken up to heaven, in all his glory; and they would be most especially careful to give a just and full idea of him to the Jewish and heathen world; whom they called upon to believe in him. I shall therefore put down their own words, that it may be seen in what manner they exhibited him in their sermons and discourses.

Peter, in his first sermon, says; *Ye men of Israel, bear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, wonders and signs, which God did by him, in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain; whom God hath raised up, &c. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Acts ii. 22, 23, 24. 36.*

It is to be well noted here, that Peter is the spokesman in the name of all the apostles; so that we have in this declaration of Peter's the concurrent testimony of the other apostles, that their late master, and then newly exalted Lord, was a man, who had died by a violent and unjust death upon the cross.

After



After the healing of the man lame from his mother's womb, by a word's speaking, in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, by the apostles Peter and John, Peter thus addresses the multitude that was crouding together about them; *Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this! or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness, we had made this man to walk. The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his servant Jesus, whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. Moses truly said unto the fathers, (Deut. xviii. 15. 18.) A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me.—Unto you first, God having raised up his servant Jesus, sent him to bless you. Acts iii. 12, 13, 22. 26.*

God anointed Jesus of Nazareth, (i. e. the man who had been brought up at Nazareth,) with the holy spirit and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him; part of Peter's speech to the roman military officer, x. 38.

Of this man (David's) seed, hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus, &c. &c.; the declaration of Paul and Barnabas in the jewish synagogue at Antioch,—xiii. 23.

God, that made the world and all things that are therein—hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead; Paul's testimony to Christ, in the court of Areopagus at Athens, Acts xvii. 24. 31.

Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the scriptures;

tures; opening and alleging, that the Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is the Christ; Paul in the Jewish synagogue at Thessalonica, Acts xvii. 2, 3. informing the audience, which consisted of Jews and heathens, who the Christ, the Messiah, the founder of this new religion, was, and that it was no disgrace to him to have been put to death, for that God shewed his approbation of him by soon raising him to life again; and moreover, that it was of divine appointment before he was born, that he should suffer in the cause of truth.

The Jews, who heard Peter call Christ a man, of a particular tribe and family among them; distinguished by works of a miraculous power, which God wrought by him, and after a series of injurious and cruel usage put to death; would certainly draw this inference from it, that he was a human creature, like themselves, high in the divine favour.

And Paul would leave the minds of his Athenian auditors, impressed with no other idea of Jesus, than that of a man, honoured and intrusted in a most extraordinary manner by the creator of the world (m).

Whoever

(m) It is upon very slight grounds that some have supposed a passage in Paul's farewell speech to the elders of Ephesus, to imply Christ to have been above the condition of a creature, nay to be God himself. The words are these: Acts xx. 28. *Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the holy spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* In several ancient manuscripts, it is purchased with the blood of his own son. And however some have reconciled themselves to it, the expression of God's blood, is spoken of as something quite shocking, by Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom, &c. whence we may learn that these words were not in the book of The Acts in their time. See Wettstein in loc. But the true reading, and the words of the apostle himself, most probably were—*feed the church of the Lord, i. e. of Christ, which he hath purchased with his blood.* See particularly Griesbach upon the passage.

Whoever, then preaches Christ, under any other character than that of a man, of the most consummate virtue; filling an important office in the moral world by the appointment of God, and qualified with divine power for the discharge of it, does not appear to conform to the precedent set us by the apostles of Christ. And it may deserve to be seriously considered, whether such preaching does not come under the censure of being wise above what is written.

I might here rest the matter, and conclude *a priori*, that there can be nothing in the subsequent writings of the New Testament, contrary to this which we have shewn to be the doctrine of Jesus himself, and his apostles in the four gospels and The Acts. But that nothing may be wanting to finish the argument, I shall examine what is the idea of their divine master, which his apostles inculcate in their letters sent to particular congregations and descriptions of christians, and to private persons, and also in the Apocalypse.

#### SECTION V.

*Whether it may be gathered from the epistles of St. Paul, that it was his sentiment and full persuasion, that Christ was merely a human being.*

Besides what may be concluded from his general tenour of speaking, Paul frequently declares expressly, that Jesus Christ was one of the human race. *The gift of grace, says he, Rom. v. 15. which is by one man Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. xv. 22, 23. Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. Gal. iv. 4. God sent forth* (i. e.



(i. e. as a prophet, gave a divine commission to) his Son, born of a woman. 1 Tim. ii. 5. *There is one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.* 2 Tim. ii. 8. *Remember, that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead, according to my gospel.* Hebr. ii. 14. *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also was a partaker of the same.* ver. 17, 18. *wherefore in all things it behoveeth him to be made like unto his brethren.*

It would not be easy to find words more precise and definite to declare Christ to have been one that belonged to our race, and not to any higher class of beings. But our apostle having been supposed to affirm the contrary, in two passages more especially, they are to be considered.

Coloss. i. 16, 17. treating of Jesus Christ, he says: *By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* And Hebr. i. 2. *God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things; by whom also he made the worlds.*

Here, it would seem, at first sight, that the creation of the universe is ascribed to Jesus Christ. But a nearer view will shew, that no such thing could be, or was intended by the apostle (n). For  
we

(n) It is well observed, that even from St. Paul's manner of expression, viz. *all things, that are in heaven and earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, principalities, &c.* it might be gathered, that he intended to be understood in a moral or political sense: for that there was scripture-language, with which he was sufficiently acquainted, clearly descriptive of a real creation, had he intended it; i. e. the Maker of the world, the creator of heaven and earth, &c.

we have seen him above in his speech at Athens declaring in the most solemn manner, that God made the world and all things therein, and signifying to the audience at the same time that Jesus Christ was only a human creature, (o) highly honoured and distinguished by God. Such inconsistent and self-contradictory assertions then cannot belong to the apostle. We must therefore look whether there be any other creation which in this place he could attribute to Jesus Christ.

And on inquiry, we find the term, *κτίσις, κτίσις, to create, creation*, used in the bible in a figurative sense, to signify any extraordinary change made in any thing for the better. Isaiah in particular predicts (li. 16. lxxv. 17.) the happy change and reformation introduced by the gospel, under the images of *laying again the foundation of the earth, and creating new heavens and a new earth*. And our apostle calls the true christians, *new creatures*, 2 Cor. v. 17; and speaks of their being *created by Christ Jesus (κτίσθαι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) unto good works*, Eph. ii. 10. (p) Jesus Christ then is in a moral sense, according to St. Paul, a creator, the creator of us christians, so far as our principles and lives are reformed by his gospel. And that this is the creation intended also by our apostle in this epistle to the Colossians, will appear from the manner in which he introduces it, and the connection of his discourse.

Immediately

(o) Rom. xiv. 9. *For to this end Christ both died and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living*. N. B. If Christ had been the creator of all things, he would have been Lord of the living and dead, without dying and being brought to life again. Dr. Lardner. For which I am obliged to the friend above-named, p. 407.

(p) James i. 18. *Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his (new) creatures*.

Immediately before, ver. 12, 13, 14. he tells them, among other things, that his daily prayer for them was, they might be duly thankful to Almighty God for the great and peculiar blessing of the gospel, the forgiveness of sins and restoration to the divine favour for ever; which he represents as flowing from the benignity of the heavenly Father, and confirmed to us by the blood of Christ; *i. e.* by his shedding his blood, giving up his life in attestation of the truth of his gospel, by which the knowledge of this boundless goodness of the Almighty is conveyed to us: *Giving thanks, says he, unto the Father, who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who hath delivered us from the power of darkness and hath translated us unto the kingdom of his beloved Son: by whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins.*

After this, he cannot forbear expatiating on this beloved son, the blessed instrument of the divine benignity towards us: ver. 15. *who is*, continues he, *the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature.* We are all made in the image of God. Gen. i. 27. The holy Jesus is here pronounced to bear a most perfect resemblance to him.

He is likewise, he adds, *the first-born of every creature*, πρωτοτοκος πασης κτισως, *the chief, the head*, (Pl. lxxxix. 27.) *of the whole new creation*, (q) as it may be

(q) It gives satisfaction to see this interpretation adopted by a learned christian bishop about the time of the council of Nice, Πως γαρ δυνατον, τοι αυτα, πρωτοτοκον ειναι τινος; αλλα του πρωτου καινου ανθρωπου, ης ου τα παντα ανακεφαλαιοσαθεν εβληθη ο Θεος, ταυτα και Θεου γραφει πρωτοτοκον πασης ονομαζει κτισως. Euseb. contra Marcell. i. ii, p. 44. It is on Christ being called *the first-born* of every creature, Col. i. 15. that Marcellus here remarks: *How could it be possible for him who existed always, to be the first-born of any one? But the holy scriptures*  
*file*



be rendered; of the whole christian world, composed of jews and gentiles now united together: the chief, or head, in such sort as the elder brother is the head of the family, of the same nature with those under him. In the same stile and to the like purpose, our apostle in another place (r) calls Christ, *πρωτοτοκον εν πολλοις αδελφοις*, the first-born, the chief, the head, among many brethren, declaring him thus to be one of our species, our brother.

Catching at this idea of Jesus being the head of a countless number of new creatures, his followers, and his imagination fired with it, Paul goes on to delineate the happy and most extensive effects of the gospel, under the same image, ver. 16. *For by him were all things (s) created that are in heaven, and that are*

*file him (i.e. Christ) the first-born of the creation, the first new man, in whom God would that all should be collected together.* For this valuable quotation I am obliged to Dr Priestley's "History of opinions concerning Christ," vol. iii. p. 436. just published: an herculean work, for which posterity will owe him infinite obligations and acknowledge them, whatever the present age deem of it.

(r) Rom. viii. 29. *For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren:* i. e. Almighty God, who had foreordained the gentile world to be partakers of the blessing of the gospel, intended them at the same time to be like unto his beloved son in his future life and glory, as well as in his death and sufferings, And thus he will be the chief or head of innumerable brethren of mankind made happy by his means.

(s) The following is Grotius's admirable note upon the place. "Certum est per verbum creata omnia; (this he throws in to stop the cry of Socinianism against him) sed quæ præcedant, ostendunt hic de Christo agi, quod hominis est nomen; quomodo etiam Chrysostomus hunc accepit locum. Sed ille intelligit mundum creatum propter Christum, sensu non malo: sed propter id quod præcessit, rectius est *χριστου* hic interpretari, ordi nata sunt, novum quendam statum sunt consecuta. De quo significatu vocis *χριστου*, condere, diximus in præfationis ad evangelia, et Ephes. ii. 13. iii. 9. iv. 24."

are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things were created by him, and for him, &c. The apostle here describes the great and happy change that would be made by the preaching of the gospel, as if the whole frame of the universe and all the different classes of beings therein were to partake of it; speaking of that other world and its inhabitants according to his jewish ideas, and probably not intending to be literally understood, but only to set off the vast subject he was treating of, which he could find no words to equal.

Or if, as hath been observed by good judges in other parts of his epistles; he intended by the terms, *heaven and earth*, to signify Jews and Gentiles, whom he might not think proper to name expressly; his meaning then will be more direct; viz; that by the conversion of the jews and gentiles, between whom the world was then divided, such a change would take place for the better, in all the kingdoms and dominions of the earth, as might well be called a new creation of them.

For the explication of what follows in this passage, viz. *he is before all things, and by him all things consist*; I would refer to Grotius, and others: only remarking, that in such highly figurative language, we may not perhaps be able to take in all the author's ideas, and give the exact meaning of every expression; which is not of any great consequence.

For the right understanding of Hebrews i. 2, by whom also he (God) made the worlds; I would also refer to Grotius; and to Lindsey's sequel to his Apology, where this and the former citation from Col. i. 15, are fully considered. This however it may be proper to remark here, that the less learned readers of the bible are misled by our English translation of

of the passage, as it stands at present: for it should not be, *by whom he (God) made the worlds*; but for or on account of whom he *made* or constituted the *ages*; meaning thereby the different sacred periods, or divine dispensations; the patriarchal age, that of the law, and of the gospel: which last is stiled by the Almighty Being himself, *the age to come which I create.* *Isaiah lxxv. 18.*

It follows immediately after, *ver. 3. who being the brightness of his glory, or a beam of his glory, and the express image of his person, rather of his substance, i. e. of himself, an image of God, as Christ is elsewhere stiled; and upholding or administering all things, i. e. such as related to his divine mission and office, by the word of his power, i. e. the power of God promised to him; when he had by himself purged our sins, i. e. having in his life, at his death, and after his resurrection, done every thing that was appointed and necessary to confirm his gospel, which teaches us how to obtain forgiveness of sins and the divine favour for ever; sat down on the right hand of the majesty on high.* These last expressions, so striking and magnificent, do not refer to any personal dignity and elevation of our Lord in heaven, but to the *glorious success of the gospel, in this present world.* This there may be an opportunity hereafter of explaining more at large: for it would lead into too long a digression in this disquisition, so much swelled already beyond what was at first intended. What has been offered may be satisfactory to prove, that the language concerning Christ at the beginning of this epistle, however lofty, is nothing more than might belong to him as an exalted human creature.

It is well known and understood that *worship* is a relative term, and is to be interpreted according to the subject to which it is applied, God or the creature.



creature. And it has been often shewn, that ver. 6. of this ch. "*let all the angels of God worship him,*" can only refer to such worship and homage as was due to Christ for his meritorious sufferings for the truth, and by the appointment of Almighty God; and affords no proof of his being the eternal God, as some would strangely draw from it. Nor does ver. 8. prove any thing of the kind. For the juster construction and translation of it, is not, "*thy throne, o God, is for ever and ever;*" but, *God is thy throne*, i. e. the support of it, *for ever and ever.*

Throughout the remainder of this epistle, the apostle makes it evident beyond all doubt, that he considered Christ only as a human being, in high office and trust from God. Thus he says xii. 9, 10, 11. *We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour; that he, by the favour of God, might taste death;* (Matt. xvi. 28. i. e. might die) *for every man*, i. e. for their benefit. *For it became him*, (i. e. Almighty God) *by whom are all things, and for whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one:* i. e. descended from Adam. *For which cause he is not ashamed to call them BRETHREN.* Jesus therefore, in our apostle's account, is a creature of God, a descendant of Adam, and one of our brethren of mankind.

iii. 1, 2. *Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling; consider the apostle and high-priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; who was faithful to him that appointed him.* Christ Jesus is the name of a human being.

v. 7, 8, 9. *Who, in the days of his flesh, i. e. during his mortal life, when he had offered up prayers*  
and

and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, (Luke xxii. 41, 42, 43.) and was heard on account of his piety: though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. This is certainly the description of none other than a mortal man, first in his state of trial and improvement, like the rest of us, and afterwards highly honoured and rewarded for his perfect virtue and obedience to God (t).

## SECTION VI.

*Whether it may be gathered from the epistle of James, that it was his sentiment and persuasion, that Christ was only a human being.*

The epistle, which goes under the name of this person, is all that remains of him. The ancients call him James the less, to distinguish him from James, the brother of the apostle John. He is styled, Matt. xiii. 55. and Mark vi. 3. *the brother of Jesus.*

(t) It has been thought by many, that in two passages of his epistles, Rom. ix. 5, 1 Tim. iii. 16, St. Paul expressly declares Christ to be God. But concerning the former of these, Rom. ix. 5. where in our english translation it would seem that Christ is God over all, blessed for ever, the more just translation would be; of whom Christ came; God, who is over all be blessed for ever. But see An examination of Mr. Robinson of Cambridge, "Plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," p. 18, 19. Printed for Johnson, St. Paul's Church yard, 1785.

Where also, p. 13, 14, see an explanation of that other text, 1 Tim. iii. 16. *God was manifest in the flesh, or, which was manifest in the flesh;* in which the reader will find a just interpretation of the apostle's words, intirely consistent with Christ being one of the human race, and nothing higher, except in the extraordinary divine endowments bestowed upon him. See also Lardner's Sermons, vol. ii. p. 388.

It

It is not certain, nor is it at all material, whether he was really our Lord's brother by the same father and mother, or only his near kinsman, as the jews used the term with that latitude. This appellation however, by the way, would bespeak Christ to have been merely one of the human race, and nothing more, unless some very particular evidence appeared to the contrary.

As James was one of Christ's chosen disciples, as well as his near relation, he cannot be supposed to be ignorant who he was. And as some of those whom he addresses among his countrymen were unbelievers, it is hardly to be supposed, though in so short a letter, but that he would have dropped some hint, that Christ was a being of a superior rank to men, to engage them the more to attend to what he said, if he had believed any thing of the kind himself. But nothing more is to be collected from him, than that he looked upon our Saviour to have been one of human kind. This is signified by his stile in speaking of him, *viz. the Lord Jesus Christ*. *Jesus* was the name of a man, who was known to have lived at Nazareth, and so on. *Christ* was the title of a great prophet, of a particular tribe and family, whom the jews expected to be sent unto them; and *Lord*, was an additional title, bespeaking him the king or head of his followers, whom all were to obey. Acts. ii. 36. Philip ii. 11.

#### SECTION VII.

*Whether it may be gathered from the epistles of Peter, that it was his sentiment and persuasion, that Christ was only a human being.*

We have had this apostle's testimony before us several times in this inquiry, and it was very full



and express to his great master Jesus, being nothing more than one of the human race, adorned with extraordinary gifts and authority from God. He does not at all vary from this opinion in these epistles; but had not any call to allege any thing particular upon the subject, save what is implied in the mention of Christ's sufferings, and death, and being raised to life by the power of God, circumstances which denounce him a mortal; and which were things he had occasion frequently to mention, as the christians to whom he writes were then in a suffering state.

Some may imagine one or two expressions used by the apostle look another way, as if our Lord had existed before his birth in this world; as for instance, where he speaks (1 Pet. i. 13.) of *what the Spirit of Christ, which was in the prophets, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow*. But it has been proved by several writers, that *the Spirit of Christ in the prophets* signified only the divine inspiration, or gifts of divine knowledge in them, by which they were empowered to foretell things concerning Christ before he was born; in the same way of speaking as the *spirit of truth* (John xiv. 17.) promised to the apostles, was the gifts of a divine power bestowed upon them, to enable them to bear successful testimony to the truth of the gospel.

And in that other passage, iii. 18, 19, &c. where it is said of Christ, that *being put to death in the flesh, (u) i. e.* (see Hebr. v. 7.) having a period put to

(u) There is a somewhat parallel passage in 2 Cor. xiii. 4. For *though he (Christ) was crucified through weakness, i. e. as being mortal, ἐξ ἀσθενείας, yet liveth he by the power of God. So we also are weak, not in him, as is our present reading, ἐν αὐτῷ, but with him, σὺν αὐτῷ, καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀσθενούμεν σὺν αὐτῷ, we also*

to his mortal life by violence; *but quickened by the spirit*, i. e. restored to life by the extraordinary power of God: *By which* (spirit) *also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, &c.* The *spirit*, by which Christ is here said to have gone and preached to the spirits in prison, i. e. to the heathen world, was the miraculous power which he bequeathed to his apostles; and as they were commissioned and sent by him to preach the gospel to the heathen world, Christ himself by a very common form of speech may be said to have done it, as *qui facit per alios, facit per se*, he that does a thing by others, does it himself. This will be found to be the best account of this obscure text, which has been well explained by many persons, and is far from affording any countenance to the notion of our Lord having had any being before he was born like other men, at the beginning of our christian era.

But there are those who maintain that our apostle was of opinion, not only that Christ had existence before his birth just now mentioned, but also that Peter believed him to be the supreme eternal God; and imagine they have discovered this in the address of his first epistle. This is asserted by the present

also are mortals together with or like to him; *but we shall live with him by the power of God.* The term *ἀσθενεία*, (and so of *ἀσθενίς*, *ἀσθενέας*;) signifies the infirmities, weaknesses, maladies, incident to mortals. Matt. viii. 17. Luke viii. 2. John xi. 4. Acts xxviii. 9. 2 Cor. xii. 9. 10. The apostle here plainly speaks of Christ, as being a mortal man, as he himself was.

I have adopted the reading given by the Alexandrian and two other MSS of good note, and by the Syriac and Coptic versions. I was much surprized to find the judicious and accurate Professor Griesbach to have omitted this various reading in his very valuable edition of the Greek New Testament, as it seems necessary to make out the sense of the passage. Our Hammond's good judgment led him to adopt it.

present Bishop of Worcester in the following words;  
 "The substance of what we are to believe on this  
 "whole subject, is contained in a single text of St.  
 "Peter, where *The Three Divine Persons, yet inef-*  
 "*fably one God, the Trinity in Unity, whom we adore,*  
 "*and their respective offices, are accurately distin-*  
 "*guished.* For in the opening of his first epistle,  
 "he pronounces the christians, to whom he writes,  
 "elect, that is, entitled to salvation, according to  
 "the foreknowledge and predetermination of God the  
 "Father, through the sanctification of the spirit unto  
 "obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."  
 Bishop Hurd's Sermons. Vol. ii. p. 311, &c.

We behold here the fatal effects of accommod-  
 ating the scripture-record to the opinions of the  
 present times, and of interpreting it from a very  
 small part severed from the rest, and from the  
 sound more than the sense of the words. This has  
 led this learned and ingenious person, to violate all  
 rules of just criticism and good sense, in deducing  
 such an extraordinary doctrine from the passage  
 which he has cited from the apostle. Should not  
 on the contrary the same method have been pur-  
 sued, as in the interpretation of a passage in any  
 other antient author? This would have carried the  
 Bishop back to the times of the writer he was com-  
 menting upon; and as there is certainly nothing in  
 these two epistles, which are his only remaining  
 works, to favour such a strange doctrine as he has  
 ascribed to him, he should have examined whether  
 there were any other accounts of his opinions in  
 the sacred books of the christians, of which these  
 make a part, from which his sentiments might be  
 learned; and on these solid grounds should have  
 determined what they really were.

For want of following this just method of investi-  
 gation,



gation, Bishop Hurd has done great injustice to the apostle, and has represented his sentiments directly the reverse of what he himself has declared them to have been. For instead of acknowledging a *Trinity in Unity, Three Persons to be One God and to be all of them to be adored*, Peter himself holds forth God to be *One Person*, and Jesus to be no more than his favoured Son and servant, and the holy spirit to be only the extraordinary power of that One God, with which Jesus was invested. The following are some of the apostle's own words. Acts ii. 22. *Ye men of Israel, hear these words. Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know, x. 38. God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the holy spirit and with power, &c. iii. 13. The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his servant Jesus, &c. iv. 24. 27. (x) O thou sovereign Lord, thou art the God, who hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is—of a truth against thy holy servant Jesus, whom Thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together; &c. part of a joint prayer of Peter, and the other apostles.*

#### SECTION viii.

*Whether it may be gathered from St. John's epistles, that it was his sentiment and persuasion, that Christ was only a human being.*

These epistles of John, the favourite disciple of Christ, were composed by him in his old age, and probably after all the other apostles were gone off the

(x) *Διότι τοι, κύριε!* implying one who is supreme over all.

the stage of life. It is a fact unquestionable, that there was a very considerable party of christians at that time, who from a false philosophy, and to do honour to Christ, as they imagined, maintained that he was not really a man, liable to infirmities, sufferings, and death, but such in appearance only. And it is apparent that it was one principal design of our apostle in his two first epistles, to counteract and confute this corruption of the true doctrine concerning Jesus Christ. For he begins his first epistle under some commotion, and with great earnestness, by striking abruptly into the subject, and entering his protest against any such doctrine: 1 John i. 13. *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, which our hands have handled, concerning the word of life,—That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you.* As though he had said; “That Person, who from the beginning of the world was decreed and designed by Almighty God, (the same as John xvii. 5.) to be the great teacher of the doctrine of eternal life; whom I have often heard, and seen, and touched: that he was really a human being, and not one in appearance only, I declare unto you with the fullest authority, having had the experience of my senses to convince me of it.”

Soon after he expresses himself with great severity against the same set of men. Having a little before (ii. 18.) called them *anticrists*, or opposers of Christ, he says, ver. 22. *Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?* The apostle here probably refers to some learned christians (y), who,

as

(y) See below, in a note on Jude's epistle, Irenæus's account of Cerinthus's opinions; who was probably one of the first, that publicly maintained, and was distinguished for this doctrine.

as we are informed, in those very early times, ashamed of having a mortal man for the founder of their religion, reasoned themselves into a persuasion from their false philosophy, that Christ was a great pre-existent being, distinct from Jesus; but who sometimes descended upon him, and remained with him. In opposition to them he asserts, that Jesus, though a mortal man, liable to sufferings, and death, was nevertheless the Christ.

He again rebukes the same men, iv. 2, 3. *Hereby knew ye the spirit of God. Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in flesh, or that Jesus, who came in flesh, is the Christ, is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not, that Jesus, who came in flesh, is the Christ, is not of God, i. e. every one, who takes upon him to teach the doctrine of the holy spirit of God, i. e. the true christian doctrine, and does not believe the blessed Jesus, the founder of the gospel, to have been a mortal man, is in a grievous error. He repeats the same, in his second epistle, ver. 7. For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus, who came in flesh, is the Christ.*

So that these two epistles of the apostle John, were certainly written with a design to prove that Jesus Christ was a real and true man, like all others of the human race.

Lest it should be imagined, that although our apostle has thus vindicated this fact, of his master Jesus having been really a mortal man; yet that in other parts of these epistles, he has asserted him to have been also the eternal God at the same time, which has been the opinion of many; it will be fitting to produce those parts which have been alleged to support this opinion.

Passages in which St. John has been supposed to teach Christ to be God are the following;

1 John



1 John iii. 16. *Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us : and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.*

The words, *of God*, are known by all the learned not to have been written by St. John. Griesbach omits them (vs. 16a) in his edition of the Greek Testament ; and it is a reproach to those who have the lead and authority in such matters, that such a manifest interpolation should be suffered to have a place in any translations of the Bible, and so give countenance to the strange notion of God *laying down his life*.

v. 7, 8. *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost : and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one.*

The latter part of the 7th. and former part of the 8th. verse, printed in roman characters, are not of the apostle's writing, but are a forgery of the 5th. century. See p. 141. &c. of this volume. And notwithstanding what a late writer there mentioned hath affirmed with great heat but little truth for the passage being genuine, we may still continue to say, with the late Dr. Jortin (Eccl. hist. vol. iii. p. 10) " that this " text of the *three heavenly witnesses* keeps its place " in our Bibles, in bold defiance to the fullest and " clearest evidence against it."

ver. 20. *And we knew that the Son of God is come and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true. And we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.*

But according to the Alexandrian and other manuscripts, together with several of the ancient versions, and many of the fathers, the apostle's own words

words were : *But we know the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know the true God. And we are in this true God, in or rather by his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.* So that throughout this epistle, the apostle keeps the difference sacred and distinct between God and his Son Jesus Christ, a distance as great and infinite as between the creator and the creature. See Griesbach upon this last passage.

#### SECTION IX.

*Whether it may be gathered from the epistle of Jude, that it was his sentiment and persuasion, that Christ was only a human being.*

We have satisfactory evidence in antiquity to justify us in ascribing this small epistle to Jude or Judas, the brother of James the less, and consequently a near relation of Christ. There is a remark in an imperfect work (z) of Clemens Alexandrinus concerning the modesty of this writer, which may also be applied to his brother James, viz. that he did not stile himself in his address, the *brother* of the Lord, though he was his kinsman, but *Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James.*

In this little piece, Jude's stile in speaking of Christ, is that of honour and respect, such as was due to his lord and master, and the great prophet and teacher of the divine will to men : but he intimates nothing farther who he was, what his origin and extraction ; it being not at all necessary, his names Jesus and Christ sufficiently indicating that he was the great (Matth. xxi. 11.) prophet of Nazareth of

(z) Clemens Alexandrinus. Ed. Potter. Vol. ii. p. 1097,

of Galilee, the Messiah, the Christ. But as from one passage in his epistle, some have concluded, that this apostle held his master Jesus to be the eternal God, it will be proper to examine into it.

His design in writing appears to have been, to censure and oppose some false teachers among those primitive christians, who had corrupted the original doctrine of the gospel, *the faith* (ver. 3.) *once* (for all) *delivered to the saints*, or the christians, by Christ and his apostles. And one of his charges against them, is, ver. 4. *their denying the only Lord (b) God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.*

As the first word here for *Lord*, *κύριον*, is quite different from that which is used for our *Lord* Jesus Christ, our translators should have marked the difference, and rendered the first, *master*, or *sovereign* and not *Lord*. And the whole analogy of scripture, and the usage of Jude himself in other parts of this small letter, leads us to make a proper stop after *God*, (c) to distinguish betwixt the only sovereign God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

If these then were St. Jude's words, he therein alludes to some philosophical christians in those times, (d) who from a false philosophy about the material world,

(b) Griesbach, perceiving the word *θεος*, God, to be omitted in the Alexandrian, Royal Parisian, and other MSS. and also in some ancient versions, and by several of the fathers, has left it out in his edition of the Greek Testament. But in this case I presume, the word is to be understood and must be supplied, as the title of *only sovereign*, is not applicable to our Lord Jesus Christ.

(c) See an admirable note of Wetstein, upon the place, to prove this, if it needeth proof. See also Dr. Doddridge; who upon the whole paraphrases the passage well, and gives a good note upon it.

(d) Irenæus, who lived near those times, gives the following account of the opinions of these men. I shall take Dr. Lardner's translation.



world, and their opinion of the imperfection of the Mosaic law, denied the one supreme all-perfect Being to be the maker of the world and giver of the law, ascribing them to inferior powers and emanations from him; and from prejudices and conceits of the like kind, they would not allow Christ to have been a mortal being, who could really suffer pain, and death, but that he only *seemed* to do it; whilst others of them maintained Christ to have been a distinct person from the man Jesus. To such absurd and impossible devices and distinctions were they reduced to evade a plain fact, that Jesus was a mortal man, as described in the christian scriptures.

#### SECTION X.

*Whether it may be gathered from the Revelations written by the apostle John, that it was his sentiment and persuasion that Christ was a human being.*

There is such concurring, uncontradicted evidence, (e) from the very first, for the space of two centuries,

translation in his History of Heretics, p. 141. and refer to him for more particulars. "Cerinthus, in Asia, taught, that the world was not made by the Supreme God, but by a certain power, separate from him, much below him, and ignorant of him. Jesus he supposed not to be born of a virgin, which to him appeared impossible, but to be the Son of Joseph and Mary, born altogether as other men are; but he excelled all men in virtue, knowledge and wisdom. At his baptism the Christ came down upon him from him who is over all, in the shape of a dove. And then he declared to the world the unknown Father, and wrought miracles. At the end the Christ left Jesus. And Jesus suffered, and rose again. But the Christ being spiritual was incapable of suffering."

(e) Dr. Lardner has fairly and fully stated the evidence for and against it, in the third volume of the Supplement to his Credibility of the Gospel.

centuries, that this was the composition of John, the favourite apostle of Christ, as cannot be shaken by any doubts that some few worthy and learned men entertained about it afterwards; especially when we know that those doubts arose, for the most part, from a supposition of the book containing an account of Christ coming again to this earth, and men living with him upon it for a thousand years, in a way revolting to good minds. It was probably written by the apostle, when he was very old; and near the end of the first century.

The apostle's preface to his work begins with these words; *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him to shew unto his servants*; and it closes with a sudden abrupt introduction of God himself, who had given the revelation to Christ, thus declaring the unchangeableness of his purposes and his power to fulfill them, ver. 8. *I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord; which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.*

The vision soon after opens, and Christ is introduced, ver. 11. saying, [I am alpha and omega, the first and the last, and] *what thou seest, write in a book, &c.*

But the words here inclosed within crotchets, and put in a roman character, are known by the learned to be an interpolation, the addition of some transcriber, and not the words of the apostle. For they are wanting in all the best manuscript copies, and ancient versions of the New Testament; and have been therefore left out in some editions of the Greek Testament, as Griesbach in particular has omitted them in his; and to do justice to the readers, they ought to be blotted out of all the editions, and all the translations of that sacred book.

It

It is not to be wondered at, that Dr. Hammond, who had not the opportunity of being so well acquainted with the very small evidence there was for the genuineness of these words, should say, that *Christ here calls himself the eternal God.*

But it is unaccountable, that Dr. Doddridge should not be moved by what Mill and others had remarked of their spuriousness; but presuming them to be genuine, should give this paraphrase of them in his way; "O John, I (Jesus Christ) that am going to appear to thee; *am the alpha and the omega, the first and the last*; I boast divine perfections and glories, and assume, without robbery or usurpation, the peculiar titles and prerogatives of the one, eternal, infinite, and unchangeable Jehovah." It is most strange that he should have forgotten the first words of the book, which distinguished Jesus Christ from God, by mentioning his receiving his knowledge from God, and consequently being his creature and dependant upon him.

The Doctor subjoins the following note to his paraphrase. "That these titles alpha and omega, should be repeated so soon, in a connection which demonstrates they are given to Christ, will appear very remarkable, whatever sense be given to the 8th verse. And I cannot forbear recording it, *this text* has done more than any other in the bible, toward preventing me from giving into *that scheme*, which would make our *Lord Jesus Christ* no more than a *deified creature*." It appears hence that this passage was that which powerfully prevented Dr. Doddridge from becoming a Socinian, such as his friend Dr. Lardner was; and yet it was a text not written by the apostle, and consequently not a part of the Bible.

In



In his salutation, i. 4, 5. the apostle wishes to those to whom he writes, *grace and peace, from Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth*; breaking forth then out of gratitude into an ascription of honour and praise to him, for the noble part he had acted, in his voluntary death for the good of men; he says, *Unto him that hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, &c.*

These are evidently the qualities, attributes and characters of a human being; of one who had been a witness, a martyr for the truth of God, sealing it with his blood; and who may be said to have washed us *from our sins* in his blood; inasmuch as his dying, or shedding his blood attested and confirmed that doctrine of God which teaches us *how to obtain the pardon of our sins*.

Soon after our Lord speaks of himself in a title, that would seem only to belong to God; when he says, ii. 23. *I am he which searcheth the reins and the hearts*. But that such a general declaration is to be taken with great limitation, and restrained merely to the present subject and occasion, the writer informs us in the beginning of his book, which sets out with saying, that the knowledge of Christ which he treats of, was not any thing inherent in him, but only such as he had received from God: for he calls it, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants*.

And by and by, where our Lord speaks of some very high dignity and preeminence to which he was raised, he signifies at the same time, that others of mankind were to share with him in it, whatever it was. iii. 22. *To him that overcometh will I grant to sit*

*fit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.*

iii. 14. *These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God.* Our Lord here characterises himself first, as the truth, or teacher of the truth; next, as the faithful and true martyr, who died for the truth: and what then may we imagine would he say of himself afterwards? what was it natural to expect? Surely not that he was, the being who created all things; but rather what belonged to such a person as he had been describing himself to be; in such a sense *the beginning* or the head *of the creation of God*, as he was the beginning and head of the *new* creation, as has been above explained (p. 428, &c.) the head and chief of the whole army of martyrs, of all christians his true followers. See Grotius, Calmet, Le Clerc.

Dr. Doddridge, as others also before and after him, would understand our Lord here to denominate himself, *the beginning of the creation of God*, as being he, “by whom it was produced, and who is the “head and governor of all that he himself has made:” a sense which perhaps the words might bear, but which is contradicted soon after by the sacred writer, declaring the *single person* of God alone, to be the creator of all things, in that remarkable passage; iv. 8, 9, 10, 11. *They rest not day and night, saying, holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come. And when those living creatures give glory, honour, and thanks to him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders fall down before him that sat on the throne, and worship him that liveth for ever and ever; and cast their crowns before the throne, saying; Thou art*

art worthy, o Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power : for Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure *they are and were created.* And a little lower, xiv. 6, 7. *And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people ; saying with a loud voice ; Fear God, and give glory to him ; for the hour of his judgment is come, and worship him that made heaven and earth and the sea, and the fountains of water.* Observe the personal pronouns, and the suitable syntax and construction in the singular number throughout ; all which demonstrate, that in the apostle's idea, the single person of the Lord God Almighty is the creator of all things, to the exclusion of his Lord and Master Jesus, or of any other being or person whatsoever, having any lot, part, share or concern therein.

v. 6—13. In this chapter, we have an affecting representation of our Saviour's character, and most eminent virtue and worth in the sight of God, and the honours on that account paid to him, in being made the great Revealer of the divine will and decrees with respect to the christian world ; by a beautiful vision of a *sealed book*, and of *the Lamb that was slain* being found worthy to open it, and on this behalf receiving the acclamations of the heavenly and earthly inhabitants.

*And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb, as it had been slain ;— And he came, and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne. And when he had taken the book, the four living creatures, and four and twenty elders*



elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. And they sang a new song, saying; thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the living creatures, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying, with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying; blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.

Observe here, that whilst the sacred writer is directed to say these high things of our Saviour Christ, he is not wanting to let us know, that he was not originally any thing but a mortal creature, thus exalted for his virtues and obedience to God. For he calls him, ver. 5. in the prophetic stile, *the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David*; i. e. a man of the tribe of Judah: and of the family of David, alluding to the divine oracle, Gen. xlix. 9, 10. whence that tribe had a lion for its standard: See also Hebr. viii. 14. He was also the root, or of the root of David, descended from the same ancestor Jesse, as was well known at the time he was born; in conformity to what had been foretold concerning

him, Isaiah xi. 1. 10, quoted by St. Paul, Rom. xv. 12.

Add to this, that the most sublime character here given of our Lord, is that of a *Lamb slain*, i. e. of a most innocent and perfectly virtuous character, put to death in the cause of righteousness and truth, and for the good of mankind. But this description belongs only to one of the human kind. For God cannot die; and we are not acquainted with any other beings superior to us, that are liable to death.

Neither does the *worship* here tendered to Christ (f) together with the Almighty Being, necessarily imply him who was the object of it, to have been above the condition of a mortal creature, highly exalted by God for his consummate worth and virtue. For the term *worship* is merely relative, and to be defined and understood according to the subject to which it is applied. So that it was not therefore *the same* blessing and honour and glory and power that is here ascribed to him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb, though the same term be used; but to the former, that which belonged to the creator and supreme governor of the universe, and to Christ that which was due to the most excellent of human kind. The same is to be said of vii. 9, 10.

Were it not for the strong hold which prejudice and long habit have upon the mind, it would not be needful to mention that what was transacted in a vision, where Christ was supposed to be present, can be

(f) In like manner we read, 1 Chron. xxix. 20. all the congregation blessed the LORD God of their fathers,—and bowed down their heads, and *worshipped the Lord (Jehovah) and (David) the king.*

be no precedent for christians, his followers, to address prayer or praise to him, or to suppose him every where present to hear them; especially when there is no authority whatever for it, from any precept of his own, or of his apostles from him; or from their practice.

xv. 3, 4. *And they sung the song of Moses, the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying; great and marvellous are thy works, o Lord God almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou king of saints! Who shall not fear thee, o Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before thee; for thy judgments are made manifest.*

Here we see Moses and Christ ranked together in such connection, as to lead us to conclude both to be the servants of God, and both creatures of the human race, however superior the latter to the former. Some have supposed the song of Moses, and the song of the Lamb to have been some hymns of praise to God, in which both of them took a part and joined: in which case they must suppose, what has been the sentiment of some learned men, as not disagreeing with the Scriptures, that Moses, like Enoch, was translated to heaven without seeing death.

Or, it may be interpreted, that as the song of Moses, was that ode of thanksgiving and praise which he taught the Israelites (Deut. xxxii.) and in which he joined with them: the song of the Lamb may be a hymn of praise taught by Christ, in which he united with his followers, and celebrated the praises of God. The song which is here introduced, is certainly most agreeable to Christ's doctrine, and to the present occasion of triumph suggested in the prophecy; viz. that God alone is to be worshiped; and that he himself and no other person



person whatsoever besides him is to be acknowledged in and for every thing; and that in time all the world will be brought to acknowledge this great and important truth.

xxii. 13. *I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.*

The Divine Being, in the beginning of this book, says of himself, *I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty*, i. 8. Taking it for a thing certain, that our Lord Jesus Christ here uses a part of the same words in speaking of himself, what method would a plain unprejudiced understanding make use of to arrive at their true meaning! Not surely presume, that they are to be understood as when applied to God, or that they imply Christ to be the eternal God: for the words in themselves imply no such thing. But it would instantly occur, that Christ is to be considered and understood as the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, in some way suited to his character, as the last great prophet and messenger of heaven to men, the (Heb. iii. 1.) *apostle of our profession*, and the prime instrument of God in forwarding the virtue and everlasting salvation of mankind. Thus, for instance, he may be *the first and the last*, because the great plan of the gospel began with him, and will be carried to its completion by him. And as it began, it will finish with him, as he is the final judge appointed, who is to decide the fate of his followers and of all mankind.

Besides, as this sacred writer, often before speaks of Christ, in this vision, as a human being, and brings him in also very soon after this, ver. 16. calling himself one of the human race, he could not be guilty of such an inconsistency and contradiction as to usher him in with the same breath as it were, uttering what is supposed to amount to the saying of himself, "I am the  
" eternal

“ eternal God,” and thus making two eternal Gods. The prejudices of worthy men may hinder them from seeing such contradictions and impossibilities: but they are not for that the less palpable and real.

The reader will judge for himself, how far the following interpretation of Wetstein is well founded; who says, (g) that it is not Jesus Christ, but Almighty God, to whom this declaration, *I am alpha and omega*, the first and the last, is to be referred in this 13th verse; as being spoken by the angel who personated God. For this angel says, ver. 6. *These sayings are faithful and true, and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel, to shew to his servants the things that must shortly be done. Behold, I come quickly. Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book.* And it is the same angel, that in this 13th verse speaks in the name of God, *I am alpha and omega*, &c. Whoever observes the continual sudden transitions, and change of speakers, in an abrupt manner, throughout the vision, will not think this interpretation improbable. And it would appear still more to be the fact, if as Beza conjectures, there be here a transposition of the verses, a mistake not seldom made by transcribers, and the 13th verse is to take place of the 12th, when the reading of the whole passage will be this, ver. 10. *And he (the angel) saith unto me, seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand.* ver. 11. *He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still.* ver. 13. *I am alpha and omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.* ver. 12. *And behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his work shall be.*

GRAND

(g) All that he comments upon it, is in these few words, ver. 13. E72.] Angelus Dei nomine loquitur; comm. 6.

### GRAND COROLLARY.

1. We have seen, in the foregoing pages, the several declarations of our Lord Jesus Christ, recorded by the four evangelists, that he was a human creature like the rest of us; brought out of nothing into existence by the Great creator of all things, and then beginning to be, when he was born in Judea, about the commencement of our christian era.

And upon a strict scrutiny, we have found these declarations uncontradicted and unimpeached by any of those high things, supposed to lean the contrary way, which he at any other time spoke concerning himself, either as recorded by the apostle John, or any other of the evangelists.

We have also found the testimony of these four historians of his life, full and express to the same purpose, of their master Jesus being one of the human race like themselves, but indued with high powers and vouchsafements from Almighty God, to fit him for his great office of Saviour and Reformer of mankind.

There is moreover such a combination of evidence to this great point, of Christ being merely a human being with extraordinary powers from God, in St. Luke's second treatise called The Acts, as must have great effect upon every one who will attend to it. For besides his own opinion as the historian of the fact and of so many circumstances that confirm it, we have the declarations of the apostles Peter and John jointly; of all the apostles together in their solemn address to the Almighty; of Peter and Paul separately: all concurring



concurring to the same point, in such language as cannot be evaded, without destroying the use of all language to ascertain any thing.

The evidence of several of the apostles also has been taken in their different letters or epistles transmitted to private individuals or different congregations of christians, and found to conspire with their testimony in other places, attesting our Lord to have been originally one of the human race, and nothing more. And those sayings of theirs concerning him, which have been supposed to assert the contrary, have been examined, and nothing of the kind has been seen in them.

And last of all, in *the Revelation* made to the apostle John by Christ himself, after his ascension into heaven, we have seen the most indubitable marks and testimony of our Lord considering himself at that time, as originally nothing more than one of the human race, and being spoken of as such only throughout, the faithful witness raised up, of *the root and offspring of David*, who sealed and attested the truth he taught by dying for it, and therefore exalted to high dignity and honour by the benevolent parent of his creatures, and sovereign disposer of all things.

We are therefore authorized to conclude, *with all the force of demonstration which the subject is capable of*, that our Lord Jesus Christ was one of the human race, beginning to exist at the time of his birth, as related by the historians of his life; and his mortal life ending then, when, as Tacitus the roman historian informs us, he was put to death in the reign of Tiberius, by Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea, under that emperor; but raised by the power of God to an immortal life and happiness in three days, with a privilege conferred upon him for his consummate

consummate virtue and obedience to God, of bestowing the same inestimable blessing on all his faithful virtuous followers, at his second coming to judge the world.

### SCHOLIUM.

1. If the facts upon which this conclusion is formed, be well founded, and the Scriptures which convey them to us rightly interpreted, of either of which I have no doubt, the foregoing grand inference from them, of Christ being wholly a human creature with extraordinary divine gifts conferred upon him, cannot be invalidated, but on the groundless supposition usually made, viz. that his words when speaking of himself, are not to be understood as the words of other men usually are; but that being a person of a compound nature, of a human, and a divine nature, those words of his, as also those of the sacred writers, which denominate him to have been merely one of the human species, have a reference only to his human nature, and belong only to that part of him. So that when he says, that he was a *man*, John viii. 4. that he could do nothing of himself, v. 20. that he was born, xviii. 37. that he must suffer death, and have his life restored to him, Matth. xvi. 21. that it was not a thing at his own disposal to bestow the proper rewards on his followers, xx. 23. that he did not know when the day of judgment was to be, Mark xiii. 32: we must understand, they tell us, these sayings of Christ, and the like constant language of his apostles and evangelists concerning him, as applicable only to one part of his composition, and true only of him as a man: for that in the other part of himself, he

he was God Almighty, the sovereign disposer of all things, omniscient, and incapable of pain, suffering, and death.

There is an objection to this method of explanation, not easily to be gotten over, that it fixes a duplicity of character upon the holy Jesus which is really odious in itself; that when, for instance, he said he did not know the day of judgment, he deceived those that heard and those that now read his words, for that he did know it all the while in one respect, though he did not chuse to tell it.

There is moreover not the most distant intimation of any thing of the sort given by our Lord himself, or by the sacred writers concerning him; that he did not speak his whole mind, and exactly the truth, in every thing that he uttered relating to himself, at all times, without any reserve or concealment. His disciples appear always to have taken him to speak, and to have understood him, as other men.

But indeed persons who come to the reading of the scriptures, already decided concerning every thing in them, may fancy what they will, and flatter themselves that they find it; that the same being may at the same time be possessed of two understandings, by one of which he may know a thing, and not know it by another; may have a beginning of existence, and be without beginning; may be exposed to suffering and death, and at the same time incapable of either; may be at once God and man, the creator and the creature: They may entertain such fond imaginations and contradictions concerning the blessed Jesus, and by a play of words without meaning impose upon themselves thereby, so that there can be no possibility of setting them right: but whoever attends to facts and reality, will see their mistakes, and pity them.



2. It is not easy to see or to devise, in what way it is possible for those christians who maintain the pre-existence of Christ as a great superangelic spirit, to escape the force of this evidence of Christ himself and his apostles produced above, that he was purely one of human kind, and intirely without any being at all, till he was born in this world.

It certainly ought to affect them, that, to all appearance, Matthew, Mark and Luke died, without any knowlege of their master having lived in another world before he was born; for we find no mention made, nor any traces of it in their writings. Nor have we any grounds to believe that they knew any thing of their fellow-apostle John publishing an account of Christ after them, to supply any of their omissions; if any should suppose he has spoken to the point in question. And yet we have reason to believe, that they severally put down in writing every thing that they believed of importance to be known concerning the gospel. How can this ignorance of these three first historians of Christ be accounted for, but on the supposition that he was no preexistent being, but really a man, as they declare and describe him to have been, and nothing more, saving the divine supernatural powers, intimated to have been communicated to him at his baptism by John?

Nor can such christians, I should suppose, content themselves, or rest their cause on any incidental expressions of St. John in his gospel, supposing these not to be explained intirely to their satisfaction; because this evangelist agrees with the other three intirely in the general strain of his narrative and detail of the facts, which denominate Christ a human being only; and is described also in The Acts as concurring with Peter and all the other apostles in their sentiments

ments of their master Jesus being only one of the human race though honoured and distinguished by Almighty God above all others; and moreover has left behind him two epistles, generally acknowledged to be written with a design to prove Jesus to have been really a mortal man, in opposition to some christians who denied it.

3. Those who hold Christ to have existed before his birth in Judea, insist much on that language used by him, of his *coming down from heaven, coming into the world, coming forth from the Father*, and the like. But it has been proved by our Lord's own explication of this language, that he intended nothing more by it, than that he had an extraordinary authority and commission from God.

Ministers of the gospel therefore, and writers on religious subjects, who are convinced that these phrases do not imply Christ's preexistence, or his coming literally from another world to this; but are merely hebrew idioms or peculiarities of speech, signifying him to have been a divine extraordinary messenger, and nothing beyond: they should be mindful from time to time, to hold forth the true sense of these expressions, that their hearers or readers may not otherwise be misled into wrong ideas of Christ's person and character. For except these and a few similar phrases, there is nothing upon the *face* of the scriptures, as there is nothing *in reality*, to induce the readers of them to consider Christ as any other than one of human kind, raised up by divine Providence, and invested with extraordinary gifts and powers for the execution of the important province and department committed to him, for the good of mankind.

It is the promiscuous use of these peculiar lofty idioms of speech, familiar with the eastern nations,  
unexplained

unexplained; and of those ambiguous terms, *Saviour*, *Redeemer*, and the like, applicable to God in their primary sense, as in a subordinate one to Christ; that has much obstructed the recovery of the knowledge of the one only true God, the Father, whom Jesus taught; and which spreads and continues darkness and ignorance from age to age.

4. From the foregoing analysis, and method of inquiry, which is the only way to come at the real fact and truth, with respect to our Lord Jesus Christ, who, and of what origin he was; every impartial person will perceive, upon how very wrong principles, and intirely foreign to the question, they proceed, who speak of the doctrine of Christ being a man only, however confessedly indued with divine powers, (b) as degrading to christianity.

For

(b) Dr. Clarke's language, in this respect, cannot always be vindicated; and it would seem, by his manner of treating Socinus and his followers, that he thought it would be some screen to his own Arian notions of Christ being not God, but a being distinct from him and produced by him, to represent the Socinians as carrying matters much farther than himself. "Others, says he, (Sermons, Vol. vi. p. 99, 8vo.) diminishing yet further the dignity of our Saviour's person, have made him a mere man, and denied his having any being before he was born of the virgin." This way of characterizing these persons would insinuate to many, however far this worthy person might be from intending it, as if they were hostile to Christ, and were for sinking his dignity, and refusing him something that belonged to him. The fair way of proceeding would have been, if such men were to be mentioned at all in a sermon, which seems an improper place for such matters; to have told his hearers, that the Socinians gathered from the Scriptures, but erroneously according to his judgment, that Christ was a mere man, having no being before he was born of the virgin.

In another work, "Scripture doctrine of the Trinity, p. 99," this learned man, in explaining the phrase, John iii. 13, that Christ *came down from heaven*, has this observation; "Nothing can be more



For the point is not, what is honourable or otherwise, in our ideas, to Christ and to the gospel; but what is the truth, and the fact, and that which the scriptures teach concerning him. And we ought to be content with and acquiesce in their testimony of his being truly a human creature in his origin, like ourselves, though it may not come up to the high ideas of him, which we have been bred up in, or have been accustomed to entertain; of his being either the self-existent, eternal God; or one next to the eternal, and creator of all things under him.

“ more harsh than the Socinian interpretation of this passage, who  
 “ feign that *Christ* was taken up into heaven, as *Moses* of old into  
 “ the Mount, to receive his instructions; and then came down  
 “ again to preach.” Dr. Clarke’s readers would be ready to conclude from this representation, that those he calls Socinians all agreed in giving such interpretation of this and the like passages of the New Testament. But he should not have omitted to mention, that this whimsical opinion was peculiar to Socinus, and a few of his followers; and should have added, what he could hardly be ignorant of, that many of the writers of that sentiment, taking Scripture for their guide, interpreted the phrase *coming down from heaven*, when applied to Christ, as declaratory only of his high prophetic character, and extraordinary commission from God; as has been also at large proved in these sheets.

#### POSTSCRIPT.

## P O S T S C R I P T.

*Whether John xx. 28. affords a proof of Christ being the eternal God.*

John xx. 28. "*Thomas answered and said unto him, my Lord and my God.*"

I perceive that I have omitted to take any notice of this text, which some have thought of much consequence in this argument, and therefore it may not be passed by.

The history is well known. The apostle Thomas would not give credit to the reality of his Master Jesus being brought again to life, upon the report of his fellow-disciples and others who had seen him, unless he himself had ocular demonstration, that he was the very man that had been nailed to the cross. The divine providence thought it fitting, that our Lord should gratify him in his demand, however unreasonable, and shew him the marks of the crucifixion upon his body. Upon which the incredulous disciple made the exclamation above, *my Lord and my God*. They are plainly the words of astonishment and surprize. The point is, what he intended by them.

Now he could not intend thereby to call Christ the eternal God, because, his being raised from the dead was no proof of our Lord's deity, but only of the power and goodness of God to him.

Nor is it credible, that any man, in the use of his reason, should imagine, that one, whom till that moment he had believed to be dead, so as never to look to see him again in this world, should immediately start up the eternal Being himself.

The

The words therefore are to be considered as applied by Thomas, in a transport of devout wonder and gratitude, to the heavenly Father of all; and his whole meaning in this short ejaculation may have been, either "my Lord and my God hath done this great thing;" or, rather, in the vocative case; "O my Lord and my God, I acknowledge and adore thy hand in this; I beg pardon for my error and doubting, and thank thee for thy goodness to me."

Those who have observed in the Scriptures, the latitude with which the Jews used the terms *answered and said*, will be able to see the little foundation there is for the following remark of a popular expositor.

"My Lord and my God!"] The irrefragable argument arising from these words in proof of the deity of our *blessed Lord* (which so many good writers have stated at large) cannot be evaded by saying, that these words are only an *exclamation of surprize*, as if he had said, *Good God, is it indeed thus?* For it is expressly declared, he spoke these words *to him*: and no doubt Christ would severely have reproved him if there had not been just reason to address him thus." Doddridge *in loc.*

N. B. It is submitted to the reader, whether Thomas's giving up his master Jesus for being quite dead and gone, was not a proof of that disciple's considering him as a human creature only and mortal like others.

ELIPANDUS.



The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various committees of the Board of Directors of the City of New York, for the year 1901.

For the purpose of the present study, the following data were collected from the records of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, for the years 1900 to 1909, inclusive.

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the President of the United States to the Congress, dated January 3, 1862. The letter is addressed to the Senate and the House of Representatives, and is signed by Abraham Lincoln. The letter discusses the state of the Union and the progress of the war against the Confederacy. It also mentions the recent passage of the Emancipation Proclamation and the President's hopes for a speedy end to the conflict.

---

# COMMENTARIES

AND

ESSAYS.

NUMBER V.

---

## XI.

OBSERVATIONS ON PART OF THE VIII<sup>th</sup>,  
XI<sup>th</sup>, AND XII<sup>th</sup> CHAPTERS OF DANIEL.

DANIEL viii. 8—14. 21—25.

Ver. 8. THEREFORE the he-goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones towards the four winds of heaven.

9. And out of one of them came forth a very small horn; and it increased exceedingly, towards the south, and towards the east, and towards the pleasant land.

10. And it grew up to the host of heaven; and cast down to the ground some of the host, and of the stars, and trampled upon them.

P p p

11. Even

11. Even as high as the prince of the host did it grow : and by it was offered the daily sacrifice : yet the foundation of his sanctuary was cast down.

12. And a ministry was given, for the daily sacrifice, in transgression : and it cast down truth to the ground, and practised, and prospered.

13. Then I heard a faint speaking : and a faint said unto a certain person who enquired, " How long shall the vision, the daily sacrifice, and the wonderful transgression, the giving the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under-foot endure ? "

14. And he answered me [I say] ' unto 2300 days ; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed. '

#### GABRIEL'S INTERPRETATION.

Ver. 21. And the rough goat is the king of Grecia ; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king.

22. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up instead of it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation ; but not in his power.

23. And after the end of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of an impudent countenance, and understanding dark sentences shall stand up.

24. And his power shall be mighty : but not by his own power : and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and practice, and shall destroy the mighty, and the holy people.

25. And through his policy shall he cause craft to prosper and shall magnify himself in his heart : and in prosperity shall he destroy many : he shall also stand up against the prince of princes : but he shall be broken without a hand.

NOTES.



## N O T E S.

Ver. 8. By the he-goat is universally understood the Grecian empire: by the great horn, Alexander: and by the four notable ones, the four chiefs among whom the empire was at last divided.

ver. 9. And out of one of them] Horns represent kingdoms as well as kings; and the hebrew word *keren* is several times by the chaldee paraphrasts render'd 'Malchutha.' Bishop Newton on Proph: vol. ii. p. 6. 8vo. The local situation therefore of this new power was to be in one of the four kingdoms. Observe also, that the power in question was to *come forth*, make its first appearance in this kingdom: and not *overflow*, or be *transplanted*, i. e. was not to be an invader that had grown to a considerable height in another country.

— A very small horn] *קַרְנִי קָטָן* *perparvum*. Buxtorf. an epithet which could scarcely be applied to the Romans when they conquered the kingdom of Macedon. By this little horn interpreters generally understand Antiochus Epiphanes. But bishop Newton has shewn that the prediction does not, in many respects, correspond with his history. His lordship therefore, after Sir Isaac Newton, endeavours to shew that the little horn represents the Roman power, when they got footing in Greece. But this opinion also is liable to objections as we shall see in our progress. They who explain the little horn as meaning Antiochus, look upon him as the type of Antichrist. Taking therefore something both from them and from the bishop, let us see whether we cannot apply it to Antichrist exclusively of either Antiochus, or Pagan Rome. By Antichrist, I mean that ecclesiastico-political power,

which arose in the time of Constantine. A little horn, a King, as it is explained, ver. 23, (and the terms KING and KINGDOM are used promiscuously, ver. 21, 22,) signifies among the ancients any government, state, or polity in the world, whether monarchy, republic, or of what form soever: [Bishop Newton, ii. 33.] and therefore certainly may be applied to that mixed establishment, consisting of ecclesiastics to manage its internal affairs, while the external administration was assumed by the emperor himself. This government was modelled according to the civil; and consequently may be called in the prophecies by the same name. Thus, in the preceding chapter, the papacy is described under the similitude of a horn, ver. 8. and a king, ver. 24. And Rev. xiii. 11. the ecclesiastics are represented under the character of *another Beast*, and of them it is said, that they should make an *Image* of the first Beast, *i. e.* that they should make the church, the hierarchy, and its spiritual jurisdiction, an exact resemblance of the civil power. See Mr. Evanson's letter to Bishop Hurd, p. 52. 57. Now this ecclesiastico-political body arose from very small beginnings; and centered at first in Constantinople within the kingdom of the goat, upon the conversion of Constantine.

— Towards the south, the east, and the pleasant land.] 'This horn was to rise up in the north-west parts of those nations which composed the body of the goat, and from thence to extend his dominion towards Egypt, Syria, and Judea.' (Bishop Newton, ii. 41.) The ecclesiastical authority in the east at first centered, where the first christian emperor, the head of the body, resided, in the imperial city Constantinople, in the kingdom of Thrace, the dominion of Lyfimachus, after Alexander's death; and

and diffused itself towards Alexandria in Egypt, Antioch in Syria, and Jerusalem: which, with Constantinople, make the four original eastern patriarchates. See Mosheim vol. i. p. 182. 185. 240. 4to. The pleasant land, means Judea. Compare Ps. cvi. 24. Jer. iii. 9. Dan. xi. 16. 41. not that the extent of the church establishment would be confined to these four places, but would overspread the whole eastern empire. The affairs of the western are not the subject of this prophecy.

ver. 10. And it grew up to the host of heaven] *i. e.* asserted equal authority, to decree articles of faith, with the apostles and evangelists. Public instructors are represented under this image, Dan. xii. 3. Rev. i. 20.

— And cast down some of the host and of the stars, and trampled upon them] *i. e.* he arrogated the right of establishing creeds, in opposition to, and contempt of the inspired writings; and of crushing those living witnesses to the truth, who had the courage to oppose him.

ver. 11. Even as high] Yea he magnified himself so as to be upon a level with the prince of the the host, Jesus Christ, by presuming to legislate in his kingdom. Bishop Newton perhaps did not observe that the prince of the host was the same with the prince of princes, ver. 25. *i. e.* Jesus Christ. Is it not then more natural to call him the prince of christian teachers, than of either the jewish state in general, or the Levites in particular? whence I argue, that the host of heaven means christian teachers.

‘ The patriarch of Constantinople, elated with the favour and proximity of the imperial court, cast an haughty eye on all sides, where any objects were to be found, on which he might exercise his lordly ambition.



ambition. On the one hand he reduced under his jurisdiction the prelates of Antioch and Alexandria, as prelates only of the second order. On the other, he invaded the diocese of the Roman pontif, and spoiled him of several provinces: but the Roman pontif in his turn gave a deadly wound to the usurped *supremacy* of the Byzantine patriarch.<sup>2</sup> Mosheim i. 243. So that supremacy in the church was first thought of and attempted, by the patriarch of Constantinople; and again, \* John, bishop of Constantinople, assumed the title of œcumenical bishop, which had been granted by Leo and Justinian to his predecessors, though without any accession of power.<sup>2</sup> ib. p. 288. Assuming the title of universal patriarch sounds like putting himself on a level with Jesus Christ. Thus spiritual tyranny sprang up in the east, and was only brought to a greater degree of maturity, under more favourable circumstances, in the west. Nor can I help observing that the second council of Nice, in which image-worship was established, A. D. 787, whatever hand the pope might have in the affair, was assembled in the east, under an eastern empress, Irene; and the eastern bishops were assessors with the pontif's legates, Lowman on Rev. 3d ed. p. 199. this therefore was an act of the *whole* apostacy.

— And by it daily sacrifice was offered] וְנִסַּח. From him, under his auspices. \* No sooner had Constantine abolished the superstitions of his ancestors, than magnificent churches were every where erected for the christians: which were richly adorned with pictures and images, and bore a striking resemblance of the pagan temples, both in outward and inward form. Of these churches, some were built over the tombs of martyrs, and were frequented only at stated times; while others were

were set apart for the ordinary assemblies of christians, in divine worship. The former were called Martyria, the latter Tituli. Mosh. i. 206. See also Le Beau's Hist. of Constantine, p. 110. 278. 305.

— was offered] **קרי**. Keri. This is the reading of sixteen MSS. and of three others, at first; besides the margin of two printed copies; one that of Felix Pratensis, the other that of Van Hooght. **קרי** signifies frequently 'to offer in general,' whether sacrifice to God, (Exod. xxxv. 24. Numb. xxxi. 28. 52.) or presents to men. Taylor's Concord. The offering daily sacrifices is an expression very proper to denote the external of the christian worship; the *lifting up* of hands; the *sacrifice* of praise offered to God continually, Heb. xiii. 15. The Terumah, says Dr. Sykes, on Sacrif. p. 189, was an acknowledgment of God who dwells on high; (which is the general end of all prayer and praise) and is defined by Jos. Mede, (Works, p. 288) an offering made only to the praise and honour of God. If we understand the Hebrew to mean, that daily sacrifice was *taken away*, we have nothing corresponding to this circumstance in the explanation: whereas, understanding it as a mark of hypocrisy, it answers to policy, craft, ver. 25. The ancients, prepossessed with a notion, that this prophecy, from the connection in which it stands, must in some degree relate to Antiochus, have explained the phrase as relating to his suspension of the temple-worship: and no wonder, that after them the moderns have applied the passage to its utter abolition by the Romans. The verb used Ch. xi. 31. where the same words occur in the english translation, is **הסיר**.

— Yet

— Yet] denotes opposition, ver. 24, 25. *but* *'notwithstanding'* Taylor's Concordance, R. 473. 9. 64.

— The foundation of his sanctuary] The pronoun His, may be applied to the antichristian power, and signify the spiritual sanctuary where he offered sacrifice, the true christian church. Or rather, it may be applied to the prince of the Host, the more distant antecedent, and the meaning will be, *'notwithstanding the daily oblations, yet Christ's temple, where God was worshiped in spirit and in truth, was utterly destroyed.'* If this latter explanation be admitted, the christian, and not the jewish sanctuary must be understood: for the Supreme Being is never stiled the Prince of Princes. Instead of מִכּוֹן, three printed copies (one in the notes) and one MS *now*, read מִקּוֹם. And MS No. 1, has כּוֹ upon a rasure.

ver. 12. And a ministry was given] The pronoun Him, is not in the original. צִבָּא means a company of persons in general; and is applied in particular to that body which assembled to attend upon the worship of God. הַצִּבָּאוֹת the women attendants. Exod. xxxviii. 8. לְצִבָּא צִבָּא to perform the office of Levites. Parkhurst's Lex. Numbers iv. 23. viii. 24. Every one that entereth לְצִבָּא into the body or office of Levites. Numb. iv. 30. They shall cease, or retire, from the body or office, viii. 25. See Taylor's Conc. The word then may be understood of a large company of officiating clergy. So early as the second century, *'the christian doctors had the good fortune to persuade the people that the ministers of the christian church succeeded to the character, rights, and privileges of the jewish priesthood—and accordingly the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank*



a rank and character similar to those of the *high-priest* among the jews, while the presbyters represented the *priests*, and the deacons, the *Levites*.' Mosheim i. 88. This shews with what propriety the term may be applied to the christian established ministry. ' At this time, (cent. 4th) it was looked upon as an essential part of religion, to have in every country a multitude of churches. And hence the true and only origin of what is called the right of patronage; which was introduced among christians with no other view, than to encourage the opulent to erect a great number of churches, by giving them the privilege of appointing the *ministers* that were to officiate in them.—The greater the number of temples was which they erected in honour of Christ and his chosen followers, the more sanguine did their expectations grow of powerful succours from them, and of a peculiar interest in the divine protection.' Mosh. i. 207. And it is worthy of observation, that we have no certain account of the use of any liturgies, till the latter end of the 4th century. Neal's Puritans, vol. i. p. 37, 667, 4to.

— For the daily] *by propter*. Taylor's Conc, R. 1366, No. 265.

— In transgression] *בפשע* The clergy of those days held their functions in unrighteousness. Their vices during this, and the former century, are lamented. Mosheim i. 136. 186. They had the form of godliness, though but little of its power.

— And it [the ministry] cast down truth to the ground] Bishop Newton reads He; supposing the pronoun Him, (*i. e.* the *power* to whom the ministry was given) to stand in the text, at the beginning of this verse. We must observe too that truth was much more cast down to the ground at and af-

ter the time of Constantine, than ever it had been by Pagan Rome either at the destruction of Jerusalem (Bishop Newton p. 47.) or during the ten persecutions.

His Lordship's other version of צבא to signify 'an appointed time,' seems inadmissible in this place.

ver. 13. The Hebrew of this verse is somewhat confused; and the english translation more so. It appears to me that it ought to stand thus: 'And I heard a saint speak; and a (the same) saint said to a certain person (Daniel) who questioned him "How long—endure?"—and he said unto me (I say)—וְאֵלֶּיךָ is frequently rendered by the indefinite article A. Exod. xxxiii. 5. Josh. iii. 15. 16. See Taylor's Conc. Daniel in repeating his question, forgot the precise manner in which he introduced it: and prefaced Gabriel's reply with the usual form, 'And he said unto me.' Instead of אֵלֶיךָ ver. 14, the LXX seem to have read אֵלֶיךָ. for they render it καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ. and the Vulgate *Et dixit ei*. Comp. ver. 16.

— How long] I follow in part Mr. Lowth's translation. Bishop Newton ii. 53.

— the wonderful] מִשְׁמַע Buxtorf, refering to this very passage, translates the word *Stupendum*, as well as *Desolans*, *Desolatum*. Or, if we render it, with the english margin, *making desolate*, we may conceive that that epithet might be applied *figuratively* to any very enormous degree of wickedness, by a prophet who wrote during the babylonish captivity, and the desolation of Jerusalem in consequence of the sins of its inhabitants.

— תת the infinite mood, used substantively.

— to be trodden under-foot] The same event is expressed, Rev. xi. 2. 'The holy city shall they tread under-foot 42 months.'

ver. 14.

ver. 14. Unto 2300 days: then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.] The cleansing of the sanctuary may as well be understood of the purification of the christian church from idolatry and superstition, as of the restoration of the Jews. With respect to the exact period of its consummation, I shall only transcribe the words of bishop Newton (ii. 55.) 'The days, without doubt, are to be taken, agreeably to the stile of Daniel in other places, not for natural, but for prophetic days, or years.—These 2300 days, denote the whole time from the beginning of the vision to the cleansing of the sanctuary. The sanctuary is not yet cleansed; and consequently these years are not yet expired. When these years shall be expired, then their end will clearly shew from whence their beginning is to be dated, whether from the vision of the ram, or of the he-goat, or of the little horn. It is difficult to fix the precise time when the prophetic dates begin, and when they end, till the prophecies are fulfilled, and the event declares the certainty of them, and the difficulty is increased in this case, by reason of some variety in the copies. For the LXX have four hundred in this place; and others, as Jerom informs us, read only 200, instead of 300.' Dr. Kennicott's collations here afford no assistance.

ver. 23. After the latter end] ב *post*. Exod. ii. 23. Numb. xxviii. 6. 'ב prefixed to *time* frequently signifies *after*; nor does it always limit the context to an immediate succession.' Blayney's Jeremiah l. 4. Bishop Newton i. 370.

—אחרית. The end] Deut. xi. 12. Dan. xii. 8. See Taylor. The next notable object that presented itself in the empire of the goat after the removal of the four kingdoms, was this antichristian power.

Q q q 2

— when



— when transgressors are come to the full] These transgressors seem to be represented as contributing to the rise of the power in question. Now the vices of the Jews (Bp. Newton ii. 37.) contributed but little to the aggrandisement of the Roman empire. Nor was the measure of their iniquities full during the high-priesthood of Jason and Menelaus: for they had not crucified the Lord of life. The passage therefore may be understood, When revolvers from the true God, among professional christians, are (not, come to the highest possible pitch of iniquity, but) compleatly ripe, from their vices, for the support of an antichristian tyranny, then a king—St. Paul also says, 2 Theff. ii. 3. 'except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed,' which shews that the apostacy was to precede and introduce the man of sin.

— a king] When the seat of empire was at Rome, and Greece only a province, is it probable that the power of the Greeks, thus subject to the Romans, should be called a KING or independent body politic?

— of an impudent countenance] The original phrase, I allow, is used sometimes as our translators have interpreted it, and denotes the ferocity of a warlike nation. But yet it is applied to the impudence of a harlot. Prov. vii. 13. and of a wicked-man, xxi. 29. I should rather, in this place, understand it as expressive of impudence, than of terrible majesty, because we are told in the next verse, that he was to be mighty, not by his own power: his fierceness proceeded not from any inherent strength, but was assumed without just pretensions. It is remarkable that St. John represents the apostate church under the image of a drunken prostitute,

prostitute, Rev. xvii. 3. and that St. Paul gives its upholders the titles of liars, hypocrites, and men that had their conscience seared with a red-hot iron. The LXX have it *βασιλεὺς αἰνέων ἀποστόμων*. And the Vulg. *Impudens facie*.

— understanding dark sentences] How could this circumstance be applied, with any peculiar propriety, either to Antiochus or the Romans? Bishop Newton indeed tells us, ii. 38. 'that the Syriac translates it *skilful of ruling*, and supposes it to mean that the Romans should be a politic and artful, as well as a formidable power.' But is not this giving preference to a version above the original? Besides, he tells us that the Arabic interprets it, *skilful of disputations*. And why should he choose the former rather than the latter, but because it suits his hypothesis? Now the antichristian power of councils, summoned by emperors who presided in them, passing decrees upon those obscure subjects which are known to have employed their attention may well be called a king understanding dark sentences, or skilful in disputations. The word is rendered *ἀποκρυμμένα*. LXX *propositiones*. Vulg. *enigmata*. Buxtorf.

ver. 24. And his power shall be mighty] It is hardly probable, that (as Sir Isaac Newton supposes on Dan. p. 118.) the Grecian empire should be said to be mighty, after it became subject to the Roman: or even to subsist. The very extensive authority that has been gained by ecclesiastics in the east is too well known to be insisted on.

— but not by his own power] *i. e.* ecclesiastics borrow all their power from the state. It is this alliance that supports them. Thus in the Revelations, the woman is supported by the beast. *i. e.* the church by that combination of civil powers of which

which the beast is the emblem. See Mr. Evanſon's letter to Biſhop Hurd, p. 41. 73.

— and ſhall deſtroy the mighty, and the holy people] This is applied (Biſhop Newton ii. 47) to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem by the Romans, and may be thought applicable in ſome degree to the ten perſecutions. But how can they, or the overthrow of the Jews, be attributed to a power that centered or roſe up in Greece? The original does not apply both epithets to the people, only the latter. It might be literally tranſlated the mighty ones, and the people of ſaints: They are evidently diſtinguiſhed: and by the *mighty* we may underſtand the heathen Roman empire, which was deſtroyed in the eaſt, after the victory gained over Maxentius, A. D. 312, in the reign of Conſtantine and his ſon. And in the weſt a ſimilar event was accompliſhed, in the reign of Gratian, who rejeſted the dignity and habit of Pontifex Maximus, threw down the idols, interdicted the ſacrifices, and took away the ſalaries and authority of the prieſts. Theodoſius the Great followed his example, and heatheniſm afterwards recovered itſelf no more. Sir I. Newton on Proph. p. 293. Taylor on Apoſt. part ii. p. 4. The outward worſhip of Pagans forbidden on pain of death by Valentinian III. Millot. Elemens d'hiftoire generale. vol. iv. p. 251. See Lardner's Ancient Teſtim. iv. 332. Compare the deſcription of this event, Rev. vi. 12—17. The weſtern emperors and biſhops were members of this eccleſiaſtico-political body. But the dominion of the little horn, the king of an impudent countenance, is not ſaid to extend towards the weſt, becauſe Italy was not within the empire of the goat: and becauſe the biſhop of Rome, when he became a temporal prince, was the object of a partiſular prophecy, in the preceding



ceding chapter, ver. 8. 24. By the holy people, I understand the Christians (comp. ch. vii. 27.) distinguished by that general title from the rest of the world, without any regard to their moral character, or any thing besides their outward profession. Taylor's Key, §. 46. 127. This power then was to destroy both Heathens and Christians. Persecution began in the east by the banishment of Arius, and the condemning those persons to death who concealed his writings. Priestley Cor. Christ. ii. 173. and Constantius in his turn banished the orthodox, because they would not condemn Athanasius. Constantine deprived the Donatists of their churches in Africa, and sent their bishops into banishment. Nay, he carried his resentment so far, as to put some of them to death—at last however, to prevent a civil war, was forced to abolish the laws enacted against them, and allow the people a full liberty of adhering to the party they liked best. Mosh. i. 213. Le Beau. 368. By a law of Theodosius in the east, reputed heretics were forbidden to hold any assemblies, even in private houses. In case they did hold any, the catholics were empowered to use force against them. He went so far as to declare manicheans worthy of death. (Millot. Hist. Gen. iv. 148. Anc. Univ. Hist. xvi. 368. 424.) and that their estates should be confiscated, unless their children would embrace the true religion. A. U. H. xvi. 369. A law of this emperor pronounces it his pleasure, that all his subjects should profess the catholic doctrine of the Trinity; and that all others, whom, he says, he judges to be *mad*, should bear the infamous name of heretics; and that their assemblies should not be called churches: reserving their farther punishment, in the first place to the vengeance of heaven, and afterwards to the movements with which

which God should inspire him. Priestley ii. 174. Millot iv. 146. A. U. H. xvi. 365. He established inquisitors for the discovery of Heretics: he drove the Manichees from Rome, and commanded that their goods should be distributed to the people after their death. Millot iv. 164. A. U. H. xvi. 426.

He ordered Cynegius to make a diligent search after the Eunomian, Macedonian, Arian, and Apollinarian bishops and clergy in Constantinople, and to drive them all, without exception, out of the city. A. U. H. xvi. 386. About the same time, Priscillian was accused by several bishops: and, by a rescript obtained from the western emperor Gratian, banished with his followers from Spain. But after being restored, he was accused a second time before Maximus; and by order of that prince put to death with some of his associates, Mosh. i. 224. Under Honorius, in the west, whoever used violence to disurb the exercise of the catholic religion, was condemned to suffer death: and whoever publicly contradicted the catholic doctrines, was to be punished with exile. Millot iv. 199. Under this emperor authority was obtained for persecution unto death, by four bishops sent from Carthage for that purpose, A. D. 410. And the edict extended to all who differed ever so little from the catholic faith. But it does not appear that this decree was carried into execution. Priestley ii. 174. By Theodosius the second, in the east, it was enacted that the writings of the Nestorians should be publicly burnt: All persons were prohibited, under pain of having their goods confiscated, to give these innovators shelter, for holding any assembly. The refractory were menaced with death. The bishops and clergy infected with this heresy, were driven from their churches; and those of the laity anathematized, Millot

Millot iv. 236. To the laws of his predecessors Justinian added one, denouncing death against all those who submitted not to the doctrines he embraced. Pagans, Jews and Heretics were put to flight from all quarters. Some were driven to lay violent hands upon themselves; the Montanists in Phrygia set fire to their own churches, and perished in the flames. Depopulation, and hatred of the emperor, were the consequence of these decrees.

Millot iv. 313. Theological quarrels had often been attended with bloodshed, even so early as in the reign of Constantius, A. D. 356, on account of the establishment of an Arian bishop of Alexandria.

Millot iv. 81. But in the time of the Arian emperor Anastasius, an army of 60,000 men was raised in defence of the catholic cause: open war declared, and Constantinople besieged. Millot iv. 297. We see therefore that the prophecy, of 'destroying christians,' may be applied, and particularly to the eastern church, long before the rise of the bishop of Rome to independence.

I must intreat the reader's patience while I make a short digression relative to this first religious war. It has been observed by Mr. Evanfon, in his letter to bishop Hurd, p. 60. that as the progress of Antichristianism was gradual, so its reformation will be gradual likewise, and not instantly effected. He shews therefore, that if to the æra in which the grand apostacy gained any singular advantage, we add the prophetic Cycle, mentioned in Daniel and the Revelation, of 1260 years, it will bring us to a period in which a proportionate diminution of spiritual tyranny took place among christians. We have a similar instance of prophecy gradually completed, in the LXX years of Babylonish captivity.

R r r

From



	Ant.C.		Ant.C.
From the 4th of Jehoiakim	606	to the 1st of Cyrus	396
From the death of Gedaliah	588	to the 4th of Dar. Hyt.	310
From the 23d of Nebuchadnezzar	585	to the 7th of Darius	395

All these are periods of 70 years. See Prideaux.  
vol. i. p. 185. 192. ed. 8.

On this subject there is a good observation, Theological Repository, iv. 118. 'With respect to all promises of distant happiness, the divine Being has thought proper to exercise the patience of men, by deferring the accomplishment of them beyond the time which they had fondly fixed for it. So that their conceptions concerning the extent, as well as the nature of promised happiness, have been very generally, and perhaps unavoidably, wrong.' The writer proceeds to give instances of hope deferred among the patriarchs. Of this he has given several particular instances, p. 63. I will attempt to confirm his hypothesis by the induction of another singular example. This first religious war happened A. D. 514. to which if we add 1260, we shall arrive at the year 1774, in which the rupture between Great Britain and North America took place: an event that gave birth to a more perfect system of religious liberty than any subsisting in Europe. A system, which, wherever it extends, will make it impossible for religious discords hereafter to take place; in which the profession of christianity in some states, of protestantism in others, is the only religious qualification requisite for the enjoyment of civil trusts (a belief in the Trinity being insisted on only in one colony, Delaware); a system, the grand principle of which is the inalienable right of worshipping God according to the private conscience of the individual; the injustice of giving preference to one sect above another; and of compelling the subject

to

to maintain any ministry he does not approve. See Constitutions of the several independent States of America, published by De Lolme, 8vo. 1783. The exact degree of Toleration in the Netherlands may be seen, Guthrie's Grammar. Sir W. Temple's Works, 8vo. vol. i. p. 178.

ver. 25. Craft] Or rather *deceit*. It is unnecessary to insist upon the numberless impostures, the miracles, visions, spurious writings, interpolations and alterations of scripture, and pious frauds of every kind, that have been practised in the church, from the time of Constantine. Taylor on the Apostacy, part i. p. 30. 78. Dr. Middleton's works, *passim*. The ו prefixed to חזיה is not acknowledged by the LXX, and is probably only a repetition of the last letter of the preceding word; and בירו, in *his band*, is omitted in a MS, No. 180, written about the close of the twelfth century, and has much the appearance of an interpolation.

— in prosperity] *In copia rerum omnium*. Vulg. in the fulness of ease and security. Compare Rev. xviii. 7.

— against the prince of princes] raising himself to absolute authority in a kingdom where Christ alone has any right of legislation.

— broken without a hand] i. e. no direct attacks shall be made against the church, as such, by any human power; but it shall, as we see is the case, have its influence daily diminished. Rev. xviii. 16. 2 Theff. ii. 8. and its final overthrow will be accomplished in the subversion of those civil powers which have been its only and its long support. Rev. xix. 10.

— without a hand] See Job xxxiv. 20.

## DANIEL CHAP. XI.

Ver. 31. And after him, arms (the Romans) shall stand up, and shall pollute the fortified sanctuary, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and shall place there the abomination of him that maketh desolate.

32. And such as do wickedly against the covenant, shall he defile in slippery places: but the people that know their God, shall be strong, and do exploits.

33. And they that understand among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity and by spoil, many days.

34. And during their fall, they shall be holpen with a little help: and many shall cleave unto them in their slippery situation.

35. And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge them, and to make them white, to the end of the time: because it is for an appointed time.

36. And the king shall do according to his will: and shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every God; and shall speak marvellous things concerning the God of Gods: and shall prosper, till the indignation be accomplished: for that which is determined, shall be done.

37. Neither shall he regard the Gods of his Fathers, nor the desire of wives; nor regard any God, for he shall magnify himself above all.

38. And on account of his throne shall he honour a god of military force: even a god whom his father's knew not shall he honour with gold, and silver,



silver, and with precious stones, and desirable things.

39. And he shall practise; and to the supporters of his strength, together with the strange god whom he shall acknowledge, he shall multiply honour; and shall cause them to rule over many; and the land shall he divide for a reward.

### N O T E S.

Ver. 31. After him] *אחרי*, after the king xi. 8. See Taylor's Conc.

— Arms] 'Arms are every where in this prophecy put for the military power of a kingdom. ver. 6. 22. and they stand up, when they conquer and grow powerful. Hitherto Daniel described the actions of the kings of the north and south, Syria and Egypt, but upon the conquest of Macedon by the Romans, he left off describing the actions of the Greeks, and began to describe those of the Romans in Greece.' Sir Isaac Newton. Bishop Newton ii. 136.

— the fortified sanctuary] The Temple at Jerusalem.

— The abomination] The Roman ensigns, the images of eagles which were an abomination to the Jews: whose introduction into the temple portended the desolation of their country. Bishop Newton ii. 242.

— of him that maketh desolate] Many copies read *מבדד*, which I understand as referring to the persons who possessed the abomination. Mr. Mede translates it, *a Desolator*, Works, p. 706. 708. In like manner, Milcom is called the abomination of the Ammonites; Chemosh, of Moab; Molech, of the children of Ammon, 1 Kings xi. 5. 7. Ashtoreth, the

the abomination of the Zidonians, 2 Kings xxiii. 13.

ver. 32. Such as do] The Jews (Comp. ver. 30.) who had broken the old covenant, and done all in their power to annul the new. Had this referred to bribing the christians to forsake their profession, would it not rather have been expressed, He shall corrupt some *to do* wickedly: making the corruption the occasion of the wicked doings, and not representing the persons as doing wickedly previous to their being corrupted? Nor can I perceive any thing like *flattery*, or the most *alluring promises* (as Bishop Newton calls them, ii. 141) made use of to prevail upon the primitive christians to renounce their religion, in the famous Epistle of Pliny, lib. x. ep. 97. It appears the flattery of an inquisition. See a translation of it with some remarks, Lardner's Anc. Test. ii. 10.

— shall he defile in slippery places.] *מִן הַמְּלָכִים*: *מִן* *contaminatus, profanatus fuit.* Buxtorf. This word may be a continuation of the metaphors preceding, ver. 31. *pollute* the sanctuary, *abomination* of desolation, and may signify a defilement of them as Jews. *מִן הַמְּלָכִים* or *מִן הַמְּלָכִים* signifies 'slippery places'. Thou didst set them *מִן הַמְּלָכִים* in slippery places, thou castedst them down into *destruction*, Pl. lxxiii. 18. Let their way be dark, and *מִן הַמְּלָכִים* slippery; and let the angel of the Lord *persecute* them, Pl. xxxv. 6. Their ways shall be unto them, *מִן הַמְּלָכִים* as slippery ways in the darkness, they shall be driven on, and *fall* therein, for I will bring evil upon them. Jer. xxiii. 12. The word occurs again, (Dan. xi. 34.) and is connected with *falling*, whence I conceive that it here signifies a *perilous situation*. And by the defilement of the Jews in slippery places, I understand their defecration from being the people of God, their

their dispersion, and mixture with idolatrous nations; the treading under-foot of Jerusalem by the Gentiles; and the very great distresses her former inhabitants underwent, in consequence of this overthrow. The LXX have *ἐκείνη ἐν οὐσθίμῳ*. The word *אָרַן* indeed is often used to signify defilement with blood in particular, and is translated *περὶ σκάνδαλον* by the LXX. Numb. xxxv. 33. Pl. cvi. 38. If this sense of the word be preferred, the passage may be applied to those mutual slaughters of the Jews and Romans, which took place upon the destruction of Jerusalem, and continued till the twentieth year of Adrian. It is remarkable that part of this period is thus predicted, Rev. vi. 4. 'And there went out another horse that was red; and power was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another.' Nor is it any objection to my interpretation of the word *מְלָכִים* that it occurs ver. 21. of this chapter, where it is translated *Flatteries*. For, instead of 'shall obtain the kingdom by flatteries,' the hebrew may be rendered, 'shall strengthen the kingdom [which he shall find] in a perilous situation.' *מְלָכִים מְלָכִים, κατισχυον βασιλειαν ἐν οὐσθίμῳ*. LXX. The person here prophesied of is Antiochus Epiphanes, who found the kingdom of Syria in a very weak state, and tributary to the Romans under his two predecessors, Antiochus the Great, and Seleucus Philopator. (ver. 18, 19, 20. Bishop Newton ii. 102. Prideaux Connect. ed. 8. 8vo. ii. 142. 146.) During his reign however, he strengthened it towards Egypt, (Prid. ii. 164.) gained a victory over Ptolemy (Ib. p. 166.) and miserably harrassed and wasted the whole land of Egypt, in all his expeditions into it; carrying thence vast treasures and spoils, taken by him and his followers. (Ib. p. 204.) His successes  
are



are pointed out by the prophet, ver. 22; and he is even said to become strong with a small people, ver. 23. As to his obtaining the kingdom by flatteries, it is not probable upon the face of history. He must have applied to Attalus and Eumenes, not as a mean flatterer, who had no other interest with them than what he could obtain by fair speeches, though he would naturally promise to return their assistance, but as an injured man who was kept out of the succession by an usurper, the murderer of his brother, Prid. ii. 152. Nor were the weaknesses of Attalus and Eumenes, duped by his flatteries, the reason of their assisting him. Appian, so far from saying that Antiochus flattered Eumenes and Attalus, expressly declares that they flattered or courted him, *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ ἀνδρός*, Edit. Steph. 117. They were at this time jealous of the Romans, and desirous of having the king of Syria on their side in case of a war. Prid. ii. 153. Bishop Newton ii. 44. 108.

— but the people that do know their God.] The Christians.

ver. 33. They that understand.] Christian teachers.

— They shall fall] during the ten persecutions.

‘The persecution of tyrants raged chiefly against the apostles and holy teachers.’ Clarius, cited by Bishop Newton ii. 141.

34. with a little help] Bishop Newton interprets this of the conversion of the empire. But I rather think it refers to the short respites and occasional favours shewn them under some of the heathen emperors, Nerva, Adrian, Antoninus Pius, Commodus, Severus, in the first part of his reign, Alexander, Maximin Philip, Gallienus, Aurelian, Probus. See Echard’s Eccl. Hist. and also Lardner’s Ancient Test. iii. 344.

— And many] seems here to be copulative. During

During the persecutions the number of converts to Christianity was very great, Lardner iii. 55. 184. 333. 346.

— In their slippery situation] *ἡ ολισθημασι*. LXX. corresponding to their *fall*. Against our English translation I argue that it is not likely the prophet should represent the treacherous and temporary adherence of false brethren, by the phrase of *cleaving to them*. Nor is it true, in fact, that there were many who professed christianity in order to betray the cause. Its enemies made use of more violent measures to suppress it.

ver. 35. And some] The good purposes answered by the fall of some of the principal and wisest christians, was to try the faith of the rest, and deter the insincere from continuing among them.

— to the end of the time] The LXX render the original, both here and viii. 17. by *καιρος περιεως*. Comp. ver. 40. 'At the end of the period.'

ver. 36. And the king] The power signified by 'arms,' ver. 31. Mr. Mede is of opinion 'that the prophet in this place leaves off the Greek kingdom, with Antiochus of whom he was speaking before, and falls about the Roman.' Works, p. 667. But I cannot help thinking it evident, that the transition is rightly placed by Sir I. Newton at the 31st verse; as every thing that occurs afterwards bears so exact a resemblance to the early state of christianity, and can so ill accord with what happened to the king of Syria. Not to lay any stress upon the emphatical *η* prefixed to *מלך*.

— above every God] The king here mentioned I take to be the christian Roman emperor. And bishop Newton, ii. 149, acknowledges that this power began in the Roman emperors, who summoned councils, &c. Is it not, therefore,

S s s

strange

strange that his Lordship (ii. 374) and other learned men, commenting upon 2 Theff. ii. 3. which is evidently borrowed from this passage of Daniel, should apply that prediction to the bishop of Rome exclusively, when this evidently relates to a Grecian power? 'It may be thought an objection' says Doctor Benson, 'to this interpretation,' viz. that the man of sin, 2 Theff. ii. 3—12 means exclusively the bishop of Rome, 'that St. Paul has taken no notice of this prophecy in his epistle to the Romans; though that was the very place where he was to appear.' Most certainly this circumstance is highly in favour of our hypothesis. For supposing Antichrist to arise in the Grecian empire, in what church could the apostle more properly choose to deposit a prediction concerning him, than in that of Thessalonica, the metropolis of Macedonia? On the contrary, supposing old Rome the seat of the man of sin, what could induce Paul to write to the Thessalonians in particular about him? By 'magnifying himself above every god' appears to be meant the authority which the civil and ecclesiastical powers in conjunction, have arrogated over the religious faith and worship of christians, without any regard to the command of God or the gospel of Christ.

— marvellous things concerning] על after the verb *עבר* commonly signifies *of* or *concerning*. Gen. xviii. 19. 1 Kings iv. 33: 'We decree, says Hilary, annual and monthly creeds *CONCERNING* God.' Taylor on the Apostacy, part 2d p. 8. Ben. Mord. ii. 1042, 8vo. And were not the opinions established at the councils of Nice and Constantinople, and professed in the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, concerning the divine nature, marvellous doctrines? Had the prophet's meaning been 'against God,'  
would



would not the words of the king have been characterized as blasphemous, profane, impious, rather than marvellous?

ver. 37. The gods of his fathers] אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתָיו. LXX. I am happy to find Mr. Mede, Works, p. 668. understanding this passage of the conversion of the Roman empire. Bishop Newton objects, ii. 152, that this event was pointed at before, ver. 34. I answer that 'they shall be holpen with a little help', seems to refer to the small and occasional encouragements, shewn to the christians during the persecutions. It is not, therefore, breaking in upon, but preserving the series and order of the prophecy, to interpret the passage, ver. 37, concerning Constantine's casting off the heathen deities worshiped in the empire. His Lordship adds, 'that the character of the king here given does not seem to be designed in any part of it by way of commendation: it is not mentioned to his honour, but to his reproach, that he should forsake the religion of his ancestors. It was not the prophet's intention to praise him for renouncing the idolatry of his heathen fathers, but to blame him for apostatizing in some measure from the religion of his christian fathers.' But there seems to be no reference in the passage to praise or blame, but to the simple matter of fact, his forsaking one religion, and establishing another.

— nor the desire of wives]. There is no other word used for *wives* above once or twice in the whole scripture but נָשִׁים which is here rendered women. And the word translated, *desire*, signifies conjugal affection, Cant. vii. 10. Ezek. xxiv. 16. So that the passage refers to the discouraging marriage in the church. The Julian and Papian laws, enacted for the favour of those who married and had children, Constantine himself repealed, and allowed

greater privileges to those who were unmarried. He held in great veneration those who devoted themselves to a monastic life; and almost adored the holy company of perpetual virgins.' Bishop Newton ii. 154. See Taylor on the Apostacy, part i. p. 108.

— nor regard any god] his motives shall be merely political. This corresponds with my translation, ver. 38, 'on account of his throne.'

— for he shall magnify himself above all] This too, I suppose, alludes to the authority of emperors in councils to decree matters of faith and worship, assumed in the reign of Constantine. It is remarkable that the first act of uniformity with respect to opinions, the Henoticon, was passed in the year 482, by the eastern emperor Zeno, at the instance of Acacius, bishop of Constantinople. Mosh. i. 272. It was an eastern emperor, Justinian, by the advice of Theodore, bishop of Cæsarea, that published the edict concerning the three chapters; and a council of Constantinople assembled A. D. 553, composed of eastern prelates, that condemned them, and sent Vigilius into exile, for refusing his assent to the decree. Mosh. i. 301. Millot. iv. 357.

ver. 38. on account of his throne] על כן. A MS. No. 245, A. C. 1290, reads כן. The English version appears unintelligible. Surely it is unworthy Mr. Mede, p. 671, and Dr. Taylor, Conc. R. 835, to render the passage, *Together with God in his seat shall be honour Mahuzzim*; and, *a God of forces on his Base or pedestal*; or, referring על כן to the king, *a God of forces in his station of dominion*. Thus too Sir Isaac Newton, p. 192. 'And in his seat he shall honour Mahuzzims.' A MS. No 4, after יסבה, adds ויחדום ויחדל; and four MSS omit the whole paragraph. כן signifies a station or office; and is here applied to the regal. The phrase occurs

occurs ver. 20, 21: where it means 'On his throne:' i. e. on the throne of one king, another, his successor, should stand up. That cannot be the signification here. I translate by *propter*: and suppose the king's honouring the god of military force, to have proceeded from a regard, not to the God, but his throne: to gain over the christians to his interest and support. Let us read Mr. Echard's account of the motives that produced Constantine's conversion: 'Not long after his engaging in this expedition (against Maxentius) like a good and *prudent* man, he began to consider of some *assistance*, beyond the mere strength and courage of his *forces*. And knowing that there was a great variety of deities at that time adored in the world, his first care was to learn which of these to fix upon, and implore as his *protector* and tutelary guardian. He observed the fatal *miscarriages* of his predecessors, who had so violently stood up for the multiplicity of gods, had reposed entire confidence in their assistance, and courted their *favour* by all the formal and fond rites of worship: and that, notwithstanding their zeal, their wars had been generally *unprosperous*, and their ends unfortunate and untimely. On the contrary, that his father had acknowledged and adored one only God; and him the supreme governor of the world; who had wonderfully *prospered* his *undertakings*, and given him many instances of a divine power and goodness, through the whole series of his life. These considerations made him resolve to lay aside the vulgar deities, by which the world had been so long imposed upon; and to adhere only to the God of his father: to whom he humbly addressed himself; beseeching him to make himself known to him, and to *effectually assist him in this expedition*.' Echard (from Eusebius) vol. ii. p. 688.



688. 8vo. Who then can question whether Constantine's conversion was on account of his throne?

— a god] לאלה; for the use of the preposition ל after the verb כבד See Ps. lxxxvi. 9. כבדו לשמוך *glorificabunt nomen tuum*. Bishop Newton.

— a god of military force] אלה מלחמה. Thus the temple on account of its fortifications is called, ver. 31, המקדש המלחמה the sanctuary of force or strength. That Constantine did not look upon Jesus Christ as an humble peaceable preacher of righteousness, whose followers were to expect their reward in another world, is evident from the above extract. No! he hoped to find him a god of strength in battle, that would make him prosperous in his undertakings, and secure in the possession of the empire. The motto of his standard, *εὐεχὴ νικῆς*, implies this. Bishop Newton translates the phrase 'the god Mahuzzim;' and says the word is taken personally: and he applies the text to the worship of saints and angels, as prevailing guardians and protectors. Whereas to me it appears, that Mahuzzim is only expressive of the attribute of the God, as צבאות, Hosts, is of Jehovah; Lord of hosts: *i. e. of the universe*. Farmer on Miracles, p. 338. N. Besides, is it not more natural to suppose, that had the prophet meant that tribe or saints the Bishop imagines, he would have used the plural *gods*, instead of *a god*, which he repeats, in the singular number, as if on purpose to make us take notice that he was speaking of but ONE divinity. 'If Mahuzzim be not the strange god (says the Bishop, p. 165) it is difficult to say who the strange God was.' Yet Mr. Mede's penetration was such, that he clearly discerned in this place, the apotheosis of Jesus. 'By the strange and foreign God, says he, p. 669, whom the Roman should at length acknowledge, is meant Christ.'

Christ.' And he confirms his opinion from the oration of Licinius to his soldiers, Euseb. de Vita Const. lib. 2. c. 5. with which I shall present the reader, in the words of M. Le Beau, p. 210. 'My friends, behold the gods which our ancestors adored: behold the objects of a worship consecrated by its antiquity. He who makes war with us, makes it with our fathers, makes it with the gods themselves. He acknowledges only an *unknown* and chimerical divinity, that he may not be obliged to acknowledge any: he dishonours his army, by substituting an *infamous gibbet* in the place of the Roman eagles. If victory declares itself for our enemies; if this forlorn, *obscure* god, *unknown in his origin*, as in his existence, overcome so many powerful deities,—we will build him altars, *on the ruins of those which our fathers have raised.*'—In his next remark, however, Mr. Mede appears not quite so happy. 'For though, says he, to the Jews every strange and foreign god were a false god' (which I readily allow); 'yet to the Gentiles, who worshiped none but idols, the foreign God was the true, to those who worshiped all kinds of false gods, as the Romans did, the foreign God, whom their fathers knew not, must needs be the true.' The Romans had a custom, and our author mentions it, p. 672, of evoking the deities of besieged cities, and adopting them. This custom implies that they were strange gods, but does it follow that they must have been true? Or would the learned author have us suppose that if that people at this time worshiped *all kinds* of false gods, they had exhausted the stock of *individual* demons; had admitted the whole company, every possible human spirit that superstition could deify? The term *foreign* does not imply any thing different in the nature of the god from the divinities they had been

been accustomed to. Surely he here imposes on himself: and his error arises from imagining Christ the true God; whereas he was only a dead man revived.

— with gold] ‘Early the next morning, [after the pretended vision] Constantine informed his friends what had happened: and sending immediately for the workmen, sat down by them, and described to them the form of the standard, which he commanded them to make with the most exquisite art and magnificence. And accordingly they made it after this manner: A long spear, plated over with gold, with a traverse piece at the top, a little oblique, in the fashion of a cross; to which cross-piece was fastened a four-square curtain of purple, embroidered, and beset with gold and precious stones, which reflected a most amazing lustre; and towards the top of it was pictured the emperor in the midst of his two sons. On the top of the shaft above the cross, stood a crown, overlaid with gold and jewels, within which were placed the sacred symbol, namely the two first letters of Christ’s name in Greek X and P; and one being struck through the other.’ Echard Eccl. Hist. ii. 690. ‘In these times (the 4th century) the religion of the Greeks and Romans differed very little in its external appearance from that of the christians. They had both a most pompous and splendid ritual. Gorgeous robes, mitres, tiaras, wax-tapers, crostiers, processions, lustrations, images, gold and silver vases, and many such circumstances of pageantry, were equally to be seen in the heathen temples, and the christian churches. Mosh. i. 206. See a description of the church of the cross or holy sepulchre, Le Beau, p. 278. Constantine dedicated his new city, in which he erected an incredible number of churches,



churches, crosses, &c. according to Eusebius, .to the God of Martyrs. A. U. H. xv. 592.

Ver. 39. And he shall practise] The Bishop's translation of this verse appears excellent. I would only remark that the use of the expression in other places, (ver. 28, 30, and viii. 12, 24) authorises us to suppose the particle *ו* originally prefixed to *לְקַבֵּץ*.

— to the supporters] The Bishop shews that this word, in the original, must be understood, not of places, but of persons. Why then may we not suppose it a participle in Pihel, or Hiphil? One MS. No. 245, reads *וְלִמְנָרִי* so that possibly *לְמָרִי* *custodibus* may be the true reading.

— together with] This clause may be connected either with supporters, and signify that Constantine and his successors should honour the defenders of their power, and also of the god they had set up: Or it may be connected with what follows, and denote that the emperors should honour the priests as well as the god.

— strange God] Is it probable that by this title, the constant appellation of an idol in scripture, a Jewish prophet should mean that Being whom he had just called the God of gods? the God seems a *stranger* to Daniel as well as the Romans.

— shall cause them] This clause denotes that the power of the clergy should be entirely derived from the civil magistrate: and at the same time points out the ascendant they would gain by his assistance.

— the land] This expression, as it stands among metaphors borrowed from the military, may denote the privileges bestowed by the emperors on the clergy, in allusion to the common custom of victorious commanders dividing *the land* among their

T t t

soldiers.

soldiers. These largesses and exemptions began with Constantine. To the bishop of Rome he gave the Lateran palace. Le Beau, 109. He built and endowed several churches, he exempted the clergy from burdensome municipal offices, and the professions of the church from tribute during his reign. Millot iv. 13. Under Constantine, christian churches were considered as respectable societies. In 321 this emperor made an edict, addressed to the people of Rome, by which he gave all persons liberty of leaving by will to the churches, and especially that of Rome, whatever they pleased. He ordained also that what had been taken from the churches in the persecution of Dioclesian, should be restored to them, and that the estates of the martyrs, who had no heirs, should be given to the churches. By these means all churches had, in time, what was called their patrimony. Priestley, Corrup. ii. 418. He granted to the clergy the right of enfranchising their slaves, by their singular declaration, without formality, and without witnesses. Le Beau 188. Constantius not only built, but endowed and enriched many churches with great revenues,—exempting the bishops from all manner of imposts and taxes. A. U. H. xvi. 230. In the time of Honorius, in the west, pagans and heretics were excluded from all trusts (though pagans were afterwards admitted again) and the catholics put into possession of all the churches. Millot. iv. 199. This emperor enacted two famous laws. Every one that had a law-suit was authorized to carry his cause before the Bishop; from whose decision there lay no appeal. A law this, which, had it been suffered to continue, would have destroyed the civil courts. *ibid.* 198. And by another of this emperor, the clergy were exempted from the civil tribunals. (219)

And

And in case of failure of proof, their accusers were rendered infamous, *Ib.* Justinian was the first that gave bishops a court. He gave it however no compulsory power. It was by his regulation that in all civil cases, clerks and monks were, in the first instance, cited before the bishop: in criminal, either before the bishop, or secular judge. That the sentence of a secular judge should not be put in execution without leave of the bishop: and in case of a refusal, the emperor was to be applied to. Bishops and nuns were exempted from secular courts in every case. *Ib.* 334. By a law of Theodosius II. in the east, the possessions of ecclesiastics and monks, who died without heirs, were given to churches or monasteries, *ib.* 236, and the churches of such bishops as were infected with nestorianism, were taken away from them, *ib.* Valentinian III. in the west, in opposition to the first of that name, published an edict, by which the donations of women to the monks and clergy, were valid, *ib.* 251. He made also a law that a bishop should have no power to judge even the clergy, but with their own consent. Priestley ii. 244. Justinian enacted that the condition of having children, annexed to the receipt of a legacy, or any other donation, should be looked upon as fulfilled, if the devisee would become a clerk, or enter into a monastery. Millot iv. 374. It was necessary to point out these instances of the king's dividing the land among his supporters, in the eastern as well as western empire, previous to the independence of the Roman pontif, that that power should not be thought to have an *exclusive* right to the title of Antichrist. If however by the supporters of the king's strength we understand not the clergy in particular, but the catholics in general, we shall find the prophecy satisfactorily



ly fulfilled. Upon the conversion of Constantinople, many of the pagan officers, civil and military, were displaced, and christians put in their room. Dauterive cited by Lowman on Rev. 3d edit. p. 79. Theodosius, in the east, declared apostates and manicheans, incapable of making a will, or receiving a bequest. Millot, iv. 149. In the time of Theodosius II. a law existed, by which the goods of heretics, who died without natural heirs, were confiscated. Of this law, Anthemius, his minister, endeavoured to prevent the abuse, while he kept it however in full force, ib. 218. In this reign Pagans were excluded from all offices of trust, and condemned to lose their goods, and to exile, on conviction of offering sacrifice, ib. 220. Justin excluded all Pagans, Heretics, Jews and Samaritans from every employment, even the military, ib. 304. In short every law enacted against heretics, some of which were noted in a former part of this enquiry, operated the same way, towards the extirpation of every set of men that would not support the anti-christian power, and the division of the whole country, as far as possible, among those that would.

With respect to what remains of this chapter, I can with pleasure refer the reader to bishop Newton, who explains the king of the South to mean the Saracens; and the king of the North, the Turks, who for a long time harrassed, and at last took Constantinople. The two last verses he conjectures remain to be fulfilled; and thinks it probable they may have their completion, in the successful efforts of Russia and Persia against the Ottoman empire. In the war of the Russians against the Turks, prince Heraclius, the sovereign of Georgia, and its deliverer from being tributary to the Porte, united with Russia. He has a particular secret treaty with that power.

power. And those who amuse themselves in political speculations, say, that he will cede Georgia entirely to Russia, on condition of being assisted in ascending the throne of Persia. The progress of the Russians in Ghejlan, and their power upon the Caspian Sea, make such a revolution highly probable. See State of the Ottoman Empire, by Elias Habesci, p. 208. printed 1784. I shall close this inquiry with a few observations on the twelfth chapter.

#### CHAP. xii.

Ver. 1. Michael] About the time that the Turks shall be overcome Michael shall stand up in behalf of God's people, either the Christians in general or Jewish converts to Christianity. For it is to be observed that when the Jews become again the people of God, it must be by embracing the gospel: so that the Jews, as such, will be no more God's peculiar. Michael seems to denote some deliverer, whether Christ, introducing the millennium; or an earthly prince, or party, the instrument in the hand of the Almighty to abolish superstition. He has his title, מִיכָאֵל 'Who is like unto God,' just as the Maccabees had, from an applicable motto. It must be observed however that Dr. Kennicott much discredits the derivation of מִכָּבִי from the initials of the former part of Exod. xv. 2. by observing that the two Chaldee MSS of the history of the Maccabees have the name written מִכָּבִי; and that the reading of these MSS is confirmed by the Syriac version of the printed Maccabean history, which version expresses the word by *p* universally. 2d Dissertation, p. 535. The name appears to be applied Rev. xii. 7. to the prince who was the instrument in the hands of Providence

Providence to display the power of the Almighty, in overthrowing Pagan idolatry. The exultant language of the worshipers of the beast also, is, *τίς ὅμοιος τῷ θηρίῳ*: 'who is like unto the beast?' Rev. xiii. 4.

ver. 4. And many shall run] The prophet seems here returning to a period preceding that of ver. 2. and shews, that a circumstance attendant on, and perhaps conducive to the elevation of Michael, will be the increase of knowledge, the preaching the genuine word of God. Comp. Rev. xiv. 6. xix. 13. 15.

ver. 7. A time, and times, and a half] 1260 years. See Bishop Newton i. 489. A MS. No 180. omits τῷ ——— τῷ.

—— when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people] The word here rendered *to scatter*, signifies also *to dash in pieces*, *ῥαίνει* Buxtorf. Taylor. Judges viii. 19. Psalm cxxxvii. 9. Jer. li. 20, 21. How can the end of the dispersion of the Jews be described, by accomplishing to scatter their power? Their power (τῷ, *The band*,) was compleatly scattered by Adrian. The term *Holy people*, may be applied to professional christians, as well as Jews: and the angel's sentiment may be, that the apostacy shall continue 1260 years: and when the power of christians, that temporal power they have acquired (though so inconsistently with their character as disciples of Jesus), shall be crushed, all these things shall be finished. It will take some time to overthrow it compleatly, after the 1260 years, from the conversion of Constantine, or the council of Nice, are expired: as it likewise took some time from that period to arrive at its zenith.

ver. 10. Many shall be] Comp. xi. 35.

—— the wise] Comp. xi. 33. 35. where the same word



word is applied to the preachers of the genuine gospel.

ver. 11. And from the time] Daniel, having asked what shall be the end of these things, is silenced without being satisfied. He is only referred to an æra 1290 years after the sacrifice shall be taken away.—With respect to this number of years, אלה is omitted in one MS No. 30. *præstabilis codex*, written about 1200. Another MS, No. 80. containing some valuable various readings, written about the middle of the 13th century, had אלה, *primo*. MS No. 82, has a rasure before אלה. And No. 157, a MS of no very great value, and uncertain whether of the 11th or 13th century, reads ושבועים ותשעים. The LXX and Vulgate follow our present reading. In the following number, 1335, אלה is omitted, No. 117, 180. שלש upon a rasure, 1. 3. The LXX and Vulg. here likewise follow our present reading. I have not a better opportunity of observing that ver. 2, אדמת עפר cannot regularly be rendered *the dust of the earth*. Two MSS omit אדמת (No. 47. 228.) though retained by LXX and Vulg.—He is taught, that at that time, something, he is not permitted to know what, shall happen. It is certainly a mistake in some learned men, (see Prideaux Connect. part ii. b. 3. *sub fin.*) to suppose the same event, the persecution and prophanation of the church by Antichrist, is predicted to continue both 1260, and 1290 days, or years. The latter number, 1290, has nothing to do with the prophanation; and points out, as I hope to shew, a very different period. In this however I would be understood to speak with the utmost diffidence. Now according to all the rules of just interpretation, the taking away the daily sacrifice, and setting up the abomination, the standard of the desolator, ought to signify

signify the same event in this place, that it does in the preceding part of the vision, chap. xi. 31. and cannot, as Bishop Newton imagines, be looked upon as a general phrase, comprehensive of various events, il. 193. In the former passage it denotes the destruction of Jerusalem, under Titus: and therefore cannot, without some evidence from the text, be applied to the Mohammedan invasion, and the erection of mosques in Christendom. Besides, setting up the abomination, in the language of a Jew, must mean the establishment of idolatry: and every one knows, that Mohammed was so far from an idolater, that his professed design was to restore the worship of the ONE TRUE God, and that his religion had much less of the abomination in it, than even the christian of his time. In the chronological Tables, subjoined to the Universal History, I find that in the year 67 Cestius Gallus marches into Judea, and lays siege to Jerusalem, but afterwards raises it: upon which Vespasian, the same year, enters Galilee with 60,000 men: A. D. 69, leaves his son Titus to carry on the war; whose army, A. D. 70, enters the city, and burns the temple to the ground. If to the years 67 and 70, we add 1290, we shall be carried to the years 1357, and 1360. In the year 1357, *Or-Khan's* ambition, increasing with his successes, he sends his son Solyman to attempt a passage into Europe: who takes Gallipolis, (which was esteemed not only the key of Constantinople, but the bulwark of Europe) and the whole province of Kharipolis. *Or-Khan's* successor, Morad, or Amwrath, pursued the conquest; subdued all Thrace; made Adrianople the seat of his European empire, and built there a spacious Jami or temple, A. D. 1381. See Univ. History 8vo. Anc. xvii. 202. Mod. xii. 57. Soon after this, the emperor became tributary to the Turks;

Turks; some say so early as 1370. Millot. Hist. Gen. Mod. iii. 3. others, in 1394: in which year the Turks granted a truce, on condition of being allowed to build a temple and court of justice at Constantinople. U. H. M. xii. 73. It is certain, however, they never remitted their activity till they took the metropolis, A.D. 1453: An event which not only put an end to the civil polity of the Greeks, but was conducive to the future downfall of the anti-christian superstition. It was the first step to the revival of learning. Banished from Constantinople, the greek literati passed, with their books, into Italy, and other countries of Europe, instructing the youth in grecian erudition, and propagating throughout the world the love of letters. Mosh. i. 765. Bishop Newton iii. 173. The admission of the Turks into Europe 1357, may be looked upon as an æra in the history of the Grecian empire, sufficiently remarkable for Daniel's notice; and indeed not very dissimilar, in its circumstances, to the period he begins his date from. In both cases, an army, bringing conquest and desolation, came against God's rebellious people: and in both case the established worship gave way to that of foreigners: as the Romans under Hadrian, built an Idol's temple at Jerusalem; and the greek church, from the taking of Constantinople, became only the tolerated religion in Turkey. The admission of the Turks into Europe, might also recommend itself to the prophet, as being about the middle of their successes against the empire; for about A.D. 1283. they broke into the eastern provinces; in 1285, made themselves masters of several places in Phrygia, Caria, Bithynia, and among others of Nice: came, as allies to the Catalans, into Europe 1289. and made Prusa the seat of empire 1327, U. H. A. xvii. 184—192. and Chron. Tab. Here then we have



two points of time, sufficiently distinguished: 1260 years, dated from the council of Nice 325, during which the antichristian power was to flourish, and since which it has been evidently on the decline. See Mr. Evanfon. And 1290 years, dated from the time that Vespasian marched into Galilee, which brings us to the rise of that power in Europe, the king of the North, who afterwards destroyed the empire of the Goat, xi. 40. As to the next number, 1335, xii. 12. I scarce permit myself to conjecture any thing about it; as I esteem it still in the womb of time what will happen at the close of that period. Yet this I will venture to suggest, that it may relate to the time in which the king of the north shall be troubled, by tidings out of the east and north, and shall come to his end: and to the contemporary standing up of Michael, which may mean, the utter extirpation of Antichristian superstition. We shall then have a third period equally remarkable with the other two, and equally important to be noticed in the place it stands in.

I leave the reader to judge of the validity of one of Porphyry's objections, repeated by Mr. Collins, 'that these prophecies were not composed by Daniel, but by some-body who lived in Judea, about the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; because all to that time contained true history, but all beyond that, were manifestly false.' Bishop Newton i. 400. Whether some events posterior to that time are not here predicted, let others determine. For my own part, convinced that they are foretold, even to the increase of scriptural knowledge preparatory to the grand reformation, which we now see taking place (ch. xii. 4.) I cannot help being satisfied with the authenticity of the book in question: and think it no inconsiderable argument that it has not been foisted in upon the world, by Christian or Jewish zealots, that

that parts of it have continued so long in obscurity, and now, in this age, are gradually explained. Had any imposition been designed, these pretended oracles would have been understood at the first moment of their publication, as well as now; and would not have waited for elucidation till this time, so long after the views of a false prophet must have been at an end. From this instance I think we have all possible encouragement to apply to the study of the prophecies: the completion of which is the only miraculous attestation we *now* enjoy to the truth of our religion.

SYNERGUS.

603

[illegible]



## XII.

### A GLEANING OF REMARKS ON MR. TRAVIS'S\* ATTEMPT TO REVIVE THE EXPLODED TEXT OF 1 JOHN CHAP. V. VERSE 7.

IN the preceding pages, 139—144, there is given a succinct, but plain and satisfactory account of the state of the text of the *Three heavenly witnesses*, 1 John v. 7; of the absence of all proper evidence of its being genuine, as also of the time when, and the person by whom most probably it was first cited as making a part of the sacred writings.

A reference was then made to a late attempt to give credit to this exploded text, intitled, "Letters to Edward Gibbon, Esq; author of the History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, in defence of the authenticity of the seventh verse of the fifth chapter of the first epistle of St. John, (By George Travis, A. M. 1784."

I would now beg admission for a few remarks upon the manner in which the author hath executed his design.

Mr. Gibbon had said; "The three witnesses, 1 John v. 7. have been established in our Greek Testaments, by the prudence of *Erasmus*, the honest bigotry of the *Complutensian* Editors, the typographical fraud or error of *Robert Stephens*, in the placing of a crotchet; and the deliberate falsehood, or strange misapprehension of *Theodore Beza*." And making abatements for his known cha-

\* See p. 147. *Nota*.

character as a sceptical writer and ironical way of putting things in the most unfavourable light, there is but too much reason for his remark; and this writer is far from having succeeded in setting aside the facts by which it is supported. And one cannot but wish that less of the air of triumph had appeared throughout his work, where in point of argument there is such just cause of shame; as being by no means calculated to overcome our Historian's prejudices against christianity (a).

It is not easy to see, how Mr. Travis can justify it to his own mind, in aspersing the characters of worthy men who happen to differ from him, and ascribing their rejection of the text in question to bad and sinister motives. It is only however with the most ignorant that the injuries he offers to the memory of ERASMUS, can take the least effect. It is readily granted, that this great man shewed a blameable timidity by inserting this spurious text in his later editions of the New Testament; which is what Mr. Gibbon alludes to in *his* way, and calls *prudence*. But lest he should be thought worse of for it than he deserves, let us state the matter as it really was.

In

(a) " If upon a patient and attentive review of the subject, you shall see no reason to reverse your former sentence, shall still pronounce the verse in question to be spurious, it will still be incumbent upon you to demonstrate to the world the incompetency of the facts stated, and the insufficiency of the arguments urged in the preceding letters in support of its authenticity. Attempt this confutation then without delay. Silence will be a proof of conscious impotence. And attempt it with candour and seriousness. Tinselled phrases and empty sarcasms will have no effect, but to double the load which now lies heavy upon you, &c. &c." Travis's letters to Mr. Gibbon, p. 124. 125. The pages preceding, 121, 122, are too ranting, and too illiberal towards Mr. Gibbon, to bear repetition.

(b) In

In his two (*b*) first editions of the Greek New Testament, Erasmus omitted this text of the *Three heavenly witnesses*, 1 John v. 7; because he found it not in any Greek MS of the New Testament, nor was it supported by any sufficient testimony of antiquity. But in his third and following editions he inserted it on the report of there being one Greek MS discovered in England, wherein it was contained. "From (*c*) this British manuscript, says "he, I have supplied what was mentioned as wanting in our copies, lest I should give occasion to "calumny and outcries against me: though I suspect that manuscript to have been corrected and "accommodated to our (Latin) copies." This was dealing frankly with the public to tell his reasons; though he ought on no account whatsoever to have given the suspected passage a place, as a real part of scripture, on such slender unsatisfactory evidence. But Mr. Travis charges him (p. 67, 68) with suppressing this text, in his first editions of the New Testament, to serve the cause of Arianism; and then again printing it in the subsequent editions; not merely, as Erasmus himself declares, to prevent the clamours of the ignorant and bigotted that might be raised against him for continuing to omit it, but, according to our author, lest his former dishonest concealment of it should be detected and exposed: thus accusing this excellent person of a deliberate falsehood and complicated meanness, all out of the fund of his own surmise and invention; for he has no other proof to bring.

Not

(*b*) In Jortin's life of Erasmus, vol. ii. p. 101, &c. the English reader may see the conscientious care which that learned man took to be rightly informed with respect to this passage of St. John's epistle, and the substantial reasons which moved him to reject it as spurious.

(*c*) "Ex codice Britannico reposuimus quod in nostris dicebatur deesse, ne cui sit ansa calumniandi; tamen suspicor illum codicem ad nostros esse correctum." Erasmi. Annot.



Not better founded are his criminations of the late Dr. BENSON, who undertook to make a report of the evidence existing for the spuriousness of this text of 1 John v. 7. And some slight mistakes excepted, the justness of his conclusions, and his fidelity as a writer stand intirely clear of the heavy charges brought against him. But with him, as not being an original writer on the subject, we have less to do.

Mr. EMLYN's Inquiry into this text of 1 John v. 7. and Reply to the Rev. Mr. Martin of Utrecht upon it, have ever been esteemed most masterly, and quite decisive as to its not having been of the writing of the Apostle. How far what our author advances is of weight to depreciate this learned and excellent person's integrity in discussing this subject, and to lessen the force of his arguments, will be judged of from what follows.

Mr. Martin, it seems, had produced a passage of Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, who flourished about the year 430; in which this suspected text was cited. To which Mr. Emlyn makes this frank reply, allowing it all the consequence it could be of in proving the text to have been extant in the 5th century. "The passage, which Mr. Martin brings, of Eucherius, of which indeed I was not aware before, will need more consideration: for though it concerns only the fifth century, yet it will carry it half a century higher than the confession of the African bishops in Victor Vitenfis; and I confess, if the passage be genuine, it is more to the purpose than any, yea than all the other testimonials, before or after Eucherius, for some hundreds of years; because here we find both the seventh and eight verses together, at once to shew us all the six witnesses; and there

WAS

was Father, Word and Spirit, beside what was said of the Water, Blood, and Spirit; whereas only Father, Word and Spirit might have been the same things mystically interpreted, after the prevailing custom of that time. So that I cannot but own that Mr. Martin had some grounds to say, this is decisive; *i. e.* as to its being acknowledged by Eucherius in the fifth century.

These words of Mr. Emlyn, being part only of his Reply, Mr. Travis prefaces with saying that he therein confesses the embarrassment into which the testimony of Eucherius had thrown him; and speaks afterwards of "his distress upon the subject; and" that, as his last poor refuge, he is driven to affect "a doubt of the passage being genuine: a doubt," says our author, in which no other writer, ancient "or modern, has countenanced him."

But so far from being under any distress on account of this text being produced in Eucherius, it is evident that Mr. Emlyn had no difficulty or reluctance whatsoever to admit it, if it could be proved really to have been in Eucherius; and was ready to give it all its weight, though coming so late as upwards of 400 years after Christ, it could have but very little. And had our author quoted the whole of what he says upon the subject and not a small part only, it would have been also seen, that Mr. Emlyn not only alleges good grounds of suspicion that the passage *might have been* foisted into Eucherius's works after his death, but offers these well-grounded arguments, that it really was so. 1. Because this 7th verse of the Three heavenly witnesses being actually in Eucherius's works, was not consistent with what Eucherius himself elsewhere advances, in his interpretation of the 8th verse; when he declares, that by the Water, Blood, and Spirit, *most persons, by a mystical interpretation,*

tation, thereby understood the holy Trinity; which he cannot be supposed to have uttered, if he had acknowledged this 7th disputed verse, which speaks of a Trinity. 2. Mr. Emlyn shews, that this text was not at all necessary to Eucherius's design to produce it in the place in which it was found; and 3. that it appears, that this treatise of Eucherius *de Formulis* &c. in particular, was in very great disorder, (to give Mr. Emlyn's own words) "as it seems the copies were not alike; for Johannes Alexander Brassicanus, in his prefatory epistle tells us, as I find it in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, that he took a great deal of pains unto weariness, in *repurgandis et restituendis*, &c. in leaving out and adding many things; *Id quod deerat adjecimus*, says he. So that all things considered, it is not improbable, says Mr. Emlyn, that this passage may be one of those additions."

In this doubt concerning the genuineness of this passage in Eucherius, notwithstanding Mr. Travis's accusation of his being disingenuous in it, we find other writers concurring with Mr. Emlyn, and also proving it to have been well founded. For Griesbach, in his *N. T.* vol. ii. p. 231. after citing the passage in question out of the *Formula* of Eucherius, says; "This passage however was thrust in by the Editor. Emlyn and Wettstein had expressed their suspicions, that the *Three Witnesses* were inserted by Brassicanus, who confesses in his preface, that he added in Eucherius what he thought was wanting, and corrected what was depraved. And those two excellent persons were right in their judgments about it. For Flacius has printed Eucherius's *Formula*, by way of Appendix, at the end of the first part of his *Key* of the holy Scripture; and in this edition of Flacius there is nothing published but these words: *Number iii. (refers) to the Trinity, 1 John v. There are three that bear witness;*



witness; the Water, the Blood, and the Spirit." After producing still farther evidence to the point, "So far is it, concludes Griesbach, from being the fact, as Bengelius supposes, that Eucherius most plainly cites this 7th verse; that it is on the contrary most evident, that Eucherius was totally ignorant of it."

Mr. Travis asserts, p. 14. that *Laurentius Valla*, who lived some years before Erasmus, was in possession of seven Greek MSS. and that this passage of St. John's first epistle was found in all these MSS. But it appears, from what Wetstein relates, that Valla contradicts himself, and that it is not certain, that he had seen any Greek or ancient Latin MS. which contained this suspected text. "Learned men, says that valuable writer, appeal to the Greek MSS. of L. Valla; who, in a note upon John vii. 29. remarks, (d) "that he had read seven Greek MSS. and as he takes no notice of any various reading of this suspected text; it is concluded that he

(d) "Provocant porro viri docti ad Codices Græcos L. Valla. Is in Jo. vii. 29. scribit se septem Græca exemplaria legisse; in hunc vero locum nullam varietatem lectionis annotat. Unde conficiunt, eum in septem Codicibus Græcis legisse, ut Versio vulgata exhibit, et nunc vulgo editum est. At primo incertum est, utrum tot Codices Græcos habuerit: nam in Jo. xviii. 28. ubi septem Codicum suorum iterum mentionem facit, discrete fatetur, eos Latinos fuisse; et in Matth. xxvii. 22. tres, ait, Codices Latinos, et totidem Græcos habeo, cum hæc compono. At multo incertius est, si omnino tot Evangeliorum Codices Græcos habuit, etiam totidem Epistolarum habuisse. Incertissimum denique est, Codices Latinos, quos habuit vetustissimos ita legisse, ut nunc in Vulgata editione legitur; aut, si ita legerunt, Græcos eandem lectionem exhibuisse. Erasmus, qui Vallam primus typis excudi curavit, et qui eum sedulo versavit, ex silentio Vallæ nihil confici posse judicavit in l. *Quid Laurentius legerit*, inquit, *non satis liquet*," Wetstein in loc.

he found it in seven Greek MSS. just as it is in the Vulgate version, and in our common printed New Testaments. But in the first place, it is *uncertain* whether Valla had so many Greek MSS. For upon John xviii. 28. where he again mentions his seven MSS. he expressly declares, that they were Latin ones. And on Matth. xxvii. 22. he says; As I am composing this, I have three Latin MSS. and the same number of Greek ones. But it is much *more uncertain*, that if he really had so many MSS. of the Gospels, there were the same number of MSS. of the Epistles along with them. And lastly, it is the most uncertain of all, whether his most ancient Latin MSS. contained the same reading of this text, as it now stands in the Vulgate Edition; or, if they did contain it, that the Greek MSS. also had it. Erasmus, who first published Valla's works, and was very conversant in them, judged from Valla's silence about this suspected text, that there could be nothing whatsoever said for it. *How Laurentius read it, says he, does not appear.*"

One wonders how a person of any learning, can persist, as Mr. Travis does, in maintaining the genuineness of *The Preface to the Seven Catholic Epistles*, falsely ascribed to Jerom, and manifestly forged long after his days, to give credit to this spurious text of the *Three heavenly witnesses*, 1 John v. 7. I suppose every other person will be satisfied with what Wetstein says upon the subject, whom I shall transcribe.

After citing the preface itself at length, in which the author speaks of his having exposed himself by what he had done in this matter, to the imputation of falsifying and corrupting the Scriptures;

Wet-

Wetstein says; (f) "Erasmus here well remarks; who would have cried out against the man, forger, falsifier, if he had not altered the common reading? It is very strange indeed, continues Wetstein, that the true Jerom should never in his writings make use of this capital text of 1 John v. 7. which is so positively asserted, in *this Preface* ascribed to him, to have been genuine, and of the Apostle's writing. It is moreover false, what the writer of *that Preface* maintains, that this suspected text was in the Greek copies of the New Testament. It is also a slanderous accusation, that the Latin Translators of the New Testament, inserted *the Water, Blood, and Spirit* and left out the testimony of *the Father, the Word, and the Spirit*. On these grounds, *Marianus Victorius, Father Martianay, the Benedictine Editor of Jerom, Father Simon, Ellies Dupin, Mill and Bengelius*, have all agreed in opinion, that *this Preface* was not Jerom's, and that it was not found in any MSS. before the time of Charles the Bald, and Lotharius, in the ninth century."

To these first authorities, and most competent judges of all others upon the subject, may be added the verdict of Griesbach in our times, no less original an inquirer than they; who says, N. T. vol. ii. p. 235. "*Non reperitur hic prologus in ullis codicibus ante tempora Caroli Calvi Sec. ix. exaratis.*"

After

(f) "Ubi recte observat Erasmus: *Quis cum clamasset falsarium, nisi publicam mutasset lectionem?* Mirum autem est, verum Hieronymum loco isto palmario in scriptis suis nunquam fuisse usum. Falsum porro est, Græcos hæc verba legisse; falsum etiam est, interpretes Latinos a fidei veritate aberrasse. Unde *Marianus Victorius, J. Martianeus, R. Simonius, E. du Pinus, J. Millius et J. A. Bengelius*, facti sunt hunc prologum Hieronymi non esse; neque reperiri in ullis codicibus ante tempora Caroli Calvi exaratis, quæ in seculum 9. incidunt, et Lotharii de quo diximus temporibus conjuncta sunt. Wetstein in 1 Jo. v. 7. vol. ii. p. 727.



After Erasmus had omitted this text 1 John v. 7 in his two first editions of the New Testament, and in his third and following ones had avowedly adopted it only to still the clamours of violent and ignorant men against him; and after that Colinaeus, the learned Paris-printer, Robert Stephens's father-in-law, had left it out in his valuable edition of the Greek New Testament, it is difficult to account for Robert Stephens's conduct in respect of this text, in the printing of his New Testament, as he does not appear to have been in possession of any new and further evidence of its genuineness. For in his edition of the Greek Testament 1550, instead of following Colinaeus's example, and marking with a semicircle or *crotchbet*, as Mr. Gibbon calls it, those words in this passage of St. John's epistle, as not genuine or wanting in the manuscript copies, viz. (*in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth*), he only put the words (*in heaven*) between semicircles or crotchets, by putting the mark after *heaven*, instead of *earth*; which is what Mr. Gibbon speaks of as not being much for the credit of Robert Stephens or Theodore Beza. And certainly, let the fault fall where it may, Robert Stephens never saw one Greek manuscript which contained this disputed text, notwithstanding all that Mr. Travis has advanced, and declaimed (see pp. 58, 59.) to the contrary.

I shall give a translation of what is said at large upon the matter by Wettstein, whose knowledge, accuracy, and fidelity are to be depended upon.

He says, vol. ii. of his New Testament, p. 724, "Stephanus editionem Erasmi 4 et 5 secutus est." &c. &c. i. e.

Stephens

“ Stephens printed after the 4th and 5th editions of Erasmus; ——— but in the margin of his third edition, he remarked, that the words of the 7th verse, *ἡ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, in heaven*, were wanting in seven MSS. which are by me marked, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 19, 50, but by Stephens 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 17. As Stephens declares, that he printed his edition most exactly from sixteen MSS which he made use of, learned men have thought that this implied, that he had found the *Three heavenly witnesses* of the seventh verse in his sixteen MSS, and in nine of them the whole verse intire as he published it; and in the remaining seven only the words *ἡ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, in heaven*, to have been wanting. For in his preface to his first and second editions, Robert Stephens says, that he had procured some MSS which were almost to be adored for their antiquity, which he had been kindly furnished with out of the King's library, and that he had collated and revised his own printed copy by them with such diligence, as not even to suffer a single letter to be put otherwise than as the most and best MSS gave testimony to and approved.”

“ In the preface to the third edition, Stephens says, (continues Wetstein) in the inner margin I have added various readings of the MSS. to each whereof the mark of the Greek numeral is subjoined, which indicates the name of the MS. whence it is taken; or of the MSS. when they are many. And I have put the marks in succession from one to sixteen: So that the first stands for the Complutensian edition: The second, for the most ancient MS. in Italy, collated by my friends. The third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, tenth and fifteenth, the copies which I had out of the King's library. The others are those which I was able to collect from all quarters.”

“ In

"In R. Stephens's answer to the censure of the Paris-Divines, p. 37. he says: 'They require me to bring them my antient MS; I answer, that it cannot be done; because it was not one only, but fifteen, that I made use of, and which were lent me out of the King's library, where I returned them.'

*"To this account of things by R. Stephens, and of his own great care and diligence, I have much to object,"* says Wettstein; First, what this very edition of Stephens's plainly shews, that the Editor hath varied from all his MSS. and introduced a different readings, not only where he has marked in his margins that a different reading from that which he adopted was found in all the MSS; but often when otherwise. Add to this, that his second edition, though it has the same Preface which is prefixed to the first, yet varies from it in fifty places at the least.

'Secondly, I would observe, that Stephens had not the use of sixteen MSS. of the first epistle of John, but only of seven. The first copy he made use of, was not a MS. but the Complutensian edition of N. T. The second, which is now the Cambridge MS. contains only the Gospels and The Acts. The third contains only the four Gospels, and is now to be seen in the King of France's library, marked 2861. Also the sixth in the King's library, No. 2866. The eighth, ditto, 2861. The twelfth, ditto, 2862. and the fourteenth, ditto, 2865. Lastly, the sixteenth is cited by Stephens only in the Revelation. There is indeed a various reading of 2 Pet. i. 4. produced from the fourteenth MS; but as that MS is still in the King's library, and contains the gospels only, it must have been a mistake of the compositors. Which kind of mistakes occur elsewhere, and much more frequently in this edition of Stephens's than is commonly



commonly imagined. This any one will readily find, who compares the Complutensian edition with the various readings from it noted down by Stephens."

"But, thirdly, what above all is to be noted, the inspection of Stephens's MSS. and ocular demonstration shews, not only that in those MSS. the words *in heaven*, but all that follow so far as to *the spirit* in the 8th verse, are wanting, [viz. the words *in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth*] so that Stephens's semicircle, which should have been put after the words *in earth* (to mark the whole of what was wanting, as it is put in R. Stephens's Latin editions, was placed after the words *in heaven*, by the fault of the compositors. This Lucas Brugensis had suspected to have been the case; but Father Simon, I. Le Long, and L. Roger, have clearly demonstrated it. Consult the MSS. in the king's library; the 2871th, which is Stephens's fourth; the 3425th, which is his fifth; the 2242d, which is Stephen's seventh; the 2869th, Stephens's fifteenth (which however he never seems to have collated in the epistles,) 2870th, Stephen's tenth, and Coislinianus 200, Stephens's ninth; and it will be manifest to every one, as it was to me who inspected these MSS. after those three eminent persons just named, that the whole of that verse of the *Three heavenly witnesses* was certainly wanting in five of Stephens's MSS. of the Catholic epistles. As to his two other MSS. as they have never yet been found, there is no determining about them."

"This mistake of the compositor, proceeds Wetstein, led Beza wrong: who gives this note upon the place, in his first and second editions. *This (7th) verse seems to me by all means to be retained:—* Erasmus reads it so in a British MS. I also have

Y y y

read

read it in some of our Robert's (Stephens) *antient MSS.*" Which is not to be understood, as if Beza with his own eyes had seen those MSS. for how could it be, when Stephens had left them behind him at Paris? but that he made use of Stephens's third edition for the purpose. But it may be said, that Stephens ought to have informed his friend Beza of the mistake of the compositor, and should not have suffered, that through this first edition of Beza, printed with Stephens's types, and the editions that followed, a mistake in so serious and important a point should have been propagated far and near. I confess there is a great deal in this remark. But perhaps Stephens neglected to inform him of it: Or, how shall we ascertain, whether Beza's note was approved or disliked by Stephens?"

Thus does Wetstein endeavour, in a very candid manner, to apologize all he can for the mistakes of Stephens and Beza. See what Griesbach says of them both; not much to their credit as editors of the the New Testament, especially of the latter, in the Preface to vol. ii. of his New Testament, p. xxiv—xxix.

The DUBLIN MS. which Mr. Travis still maintains to be ancient, p. 72. 105, is thus described by Wetstein.

(g) "The *Montfort MS.* of the 16th century contains the New Testament in octavo transcribed by a recent and less careful hand. It belonged formerly to Friar Froyht, a Franciscan monk, afterwards to Thomas Clement, then to William Charke, next to Thomas Montfort, Doctor of Divinity in Cambridge.

(g) "Codex Montfortii seculi xvi continet Novam Testamentum recentiori et minus diligenti manu descriptum in octavo: fuit olim

Cambridge. Lastly it came into the possession of Archbishop Usher, and is now preserved in Trinity college, Dublin, and marked G. 97. In the Gospels, it has the ordinary division of chapters, (that is, as I suppose, the same which is found in the Latin copies) according to *Usher*, who collated the Gospels, and Acts of the Apostles, and took care to have the various readings inserted in the Polyglots. It contains also the Prologues of *Theophylact*. Mr. Martin of Utrecht has fallen into several mistakes relating to it, and one of them truly (*b*) ridiculous. It happens that in this MS at the end of Mark's gospel there is this insertion made, that Mark wrote his gospel

olim Fratr̃is Froyht Franciscani, postea Thom̃e Clementis, deinde Gulielmi Charci, ac demum Thom̃e Montfortii S. T. D. Cantabrig. Novissime in manus Usserii pervenit, nunc vero asservatur Dublinii in collegio Trinitatis notaturque G. 97. In Evangeliiis habet capitum Divisionem ordinariam (hoc est, ut puto, eam quæ in Latinis servatur) teste Usserio, qui Evangelia et Acta Apostolorum contulit, et eorum V. L. in Polyglottis edi curavit. Habet etiam Prologos Theophylacti. Circa hunc Codicem non unum errorem commisit D. Martin, illum imprimis valde ridiculum; quod cum in hoc Codice in fine Evangelii Marci adderetur, Marcum Evangelium suum edidisse *μετα δευα χροιας, decem annis* post ascensionem Christi, Martinus annos in secula convertendo, et Marcum in Librarium qui hunc Codicem exaravit, Codicem hunc attribuit seculo undecimo. Hoc ipso Codice, quem *Britannicum* vocavit, usus etiam est Erasmus tum passim in Annotationibus tum præcipue in 1 Joh. v. 7. 8. qua occasione recte pronunciavit et recentiorem esse et ad Latinorum lectionem immutatum." *Wetstein Prolegomena*, p. 52. No. 61.

" (*b*) Mr. Travis follows the Dutch Divine in this ridiculous mistake: "But if Dr. *Benson*, says he, very gravely, "would have suffered the MS. to have been heard in its own defence, it would have marked its own age with precision. For in a Greek date subjoined to one of the Gospels, "the book affirms itself to have been written *μετα χροιας δευα* " *της τε χροιας αναληψιας, ten centuries* after the ascension of "Christ, or, in other words, in the eleventh century." Travis's "Letter, p. 72.



gospel *μετα δεκα χρονος i. e.* ten years after the ascension of Christ. But this Dutch Divine, by turning ten years into ten centuries, and the Evangelist St. Mark into a supposed transcriber of that name who wrote this copy, thence infers it to have been written in the eleventh century. Erasmus frequently makes use of this copy, which he calls the British MS in his Annotations, but particularly in 1 John v. 7. 8. when he gave his judgment of it very justly, that it was of late date, and accommodated to the Latin copies."

(i) Wetstein alleges several reasons to prove this Manuscript to be very recent, certainly later than the 13th century; and to have been corrected by the Latin copies.

What Mr. Travis cites from a letter of Dr. Wilson of the University of Dublin to him, certainly amounts to nothing. "Of the age of the MS, says Dr. Wilson, I am incapable of giving an opinion; not having had an opportunity of examining many Greek MSS and deciding on their antiquity, by comparison with the hands that prevailed in different centuries, previous to the invention of printing." Mr. Travis's letters, &c. p. 69.

I shall add the judgment of Griesbach concerning it. (k) "These words, says he, of the Three heavenly

(i) "Ipse etiam Erasmus non obscure significavit, se hunc Codicem ad Latinos relictum esse suspicari," &c. to the end of the paragraph. Wetstein, N. T. vol. ii. p. 723.

(k) Extant igitur verba ista in codice græco nullo, præter 34-illum Dubliniensem, s. Montfortii, s. Britannicum, ad quem Erasmus jam provocavit. Non desuerunt tamen, qui existimarent, Britannicum (quem post Erasmi tempora nemo mortalium vidit, aut ubinam terrarum lateat indicavit) diversum fuisse a nostro Dubliniensi. Quicquid sit, in nostro 34. hæc leguntur: *οτι τρεις ηουν οι μαρτυρες εν τω υδατι, πατηρ, λογος, και πνευμα, και αυτοι οι τρεις εν ηουν. και τρεις ηουν οι μαρτυρες εν τη γη, πνευμα, και υδωρ και αμμα*, absque sequenti *και οι τρεις εν το εν ηουν*. Sed codex est recentissimus, seculo xv. aut xvi. scriptus." Griesbach. N. T. vol. ii. p. 225. *notæ*.

"venly witnesses are to be found in no Greek MS.  
 "except that of Dublin, *alias* Montfort, *alias* the  
 "British, to which Erasmus formerly appealed. Al-  
 "though there have been some who have thought  
 "that the British MS. (which if so, no mortal ever  
 "saw since Erasmus's days, nor could point out  
 "in what corner of the world it lay concealed,) was  
 "a different one from our Dublin MS. Be that as  
 "it may, in our No. 34 (which is the Monfort or  
 "Dublin MS.) there is this reading: *For there are*  
 "*three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the*  
 "*Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one. And*  
 "*there are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit*  
 "*the Water, and the Blood,* without what follows *and*  
 "*these three agree in one.* But it is a MS of very late  
 "date, written in the fifteenth or sixteenth century."

Concerning the supposed BERLIN MS which con-  
 tains this verse, 1 John v. 7. and which Mr. Travis  
 will have also to be ancient; that it is merely a  
 transcript of the printed Complutensian edition of  
 the New Testament, even to the very faults of the  
 press, the testimony of La Croze, the keeper of the  
 King of Prussia's library where it is preserved, is  
 sufficient to satisfy every reasonable unprejudiced  
 person. What La Croze says of it is to be found in  
 (1) Mr. Emlyn's Reply to Martin, chap. i. intitled,  
 'A true account of the Berlin Manuscript, which Mr.  
 Martin says is reputed to be 500 years old; and his  
 very disingenuous concealment of the evidence he  
 had to the contrary; with the Postscript. Mr.  
 Travis's arraignment of this testimony of La Croze,  
 is such an instance of cavil and chicanery as is seldom  
 seen,

Wetstein's

(1) Emlyn's Works, vol. ii. p. 227—236. and to the end,

Wetstein's words concerning it are (m). "The second MS. which is cited in support of this suspected text, is that of Berlin; which indeed does contain the passage of the three heavenly witnesses, but not the last words of the eighth verse, and these three agree in one. But M. V. la Croze, the king of Prussia's Librarian, hath demonstrated that this manuscript is a transcript of the Polyglot Complutensian edition of the New Testament, not excepting even the very faults of the Printer; and he has moreover confirmed and again assured me of this in a letter which I received from him, dated March 3, 1731."

I shall add Griesbach's testimony concerning it, another unexceptionable eye-witness after La Croze, and now living.

(n) "In the *Ravian* (o) Manuscript which is preserved in the Royal Berlin Library, the reading of the

(m) "Secundus Codex est *Berolinensis*, qui verba de tribus testibus celestibus quidem exhibet, at non ultima commatis octavi *καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι*. Demonstravit autem *M. V. la Croze*, Bibliothecarius regis Borussiae, mihiq[ue] epistola An. 1731. 3. Martii scripta confirmavit, eum codicem ex editione Polyglotæ Complutensi esse descriptum ne demtis quidem mendis Typographicis." Wetstein, N. T. vol. ii. p. 723.

(n) "Præterea in codice *Raviano*, qui in Bibliotheca Regia *Berolinensi* asservatur, ita ut in editione *Complutensi*, legitur: *οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι* καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι. Sed quod viri docti dudum viderunt, codicem hunc non esse nisi hypographum editionis *Complutensis*, id nos ipsi verissimum esse deprehendimus, cum librum istum diligentius tractaremus, atque cum bibliis *Complutensibus* ex parte conferrems." Griesbach N. T. vol. ii. p. 225, 226.

(o) So called from *Ravius*, who presented it to the Library at Berlin.



the text in question is exactly the same as in the Complutensian edition of the N. T. viz. For there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the word, and the holy spirit, and these three agree in one. And there are three that bear witness on earth, the Spirit, and the Water, and the Blood. But as learned men have long since discovered, that this manuscript is nothing else but a transcript of the Complutensian edition of the New Testament, *this I myself found to be most true, when I examined that manuscript with all accuracy, and compared it in part with the Complutensian Bible.*"

I hope I shall be excused in adding at the close of these remarks on the very extraordinary defence of this *justly* exploded text; that a more compleat pattern of sophistical reasoning (*p*) throughout, and of bold assertion without proof I never met with, and that if my voice could extend itself to Mr. Gibbon, in his distant abode on the lake *Leman*; to whom, it may be presumed, a series of Letters addressed to him have been communicated; I would intreat that Gentleman not to judge of his opponents and of all the defenders of christianity, by this its present champion and advocate, Mr. Travis.

#### SOSIPATER.

(*p*) This spurious text being not in any ancient Greek MSS of the New Testament now extant, Mr. Travis supposes that it may have been in some ancient Greek MSS. which are lost.

And this text likewise having never been cited by any of the ancient Fathers, in the fourth century, during their hot controversy about the Divinity of Christ and the Trinity; Mr. Travis accounts for it by maintaining that those ancient Fathers did not suppose this text to relate to or to furnish any proof of the Trinity or the Divinity of Christ. Travis's Letter p. 102—109. *By such gratuitous suppositions any thing the most false may be made out.*

[illegible]

[The page contains extremely faint, illegible text impressions.]

# I N D E X

## O F T H E

### P R I N C I P A L M A T T E R S.

#### A.

- ABENDANA, JACOB*, quoted, page 182.
- Abraham*, an observation on the number of his slaves, 274.
- Adam*, in what sense death came by him, 103, Note †—The history of his fall supposed by some to be an oriental apologue, 105.
- Addison*, Mr. quoted, 207.
- Advocate*. See Christ and Comforter.
- Ainsworth*, Mr. quoted, 295.
- Angels*, worship of, prevailed much among the Jews, 195—  
in what sense they were required to worship Christ, 433—  
See Worship.
- America*, reflections on the late revolution in, 484.
- Antichrist*, explanation of that word, 469—when and where Antichrist first rose, 470.
- Antichristianism*, its reformation and overthrow, like its progress, gradual, 470. 472. 485. 504.
- Arius*, the persecution of christians by christians first began in the east by his banishment, 481.
- Anthemius*, prime minister of Theodosius II. prevents the abuse of an intolerant law, 502. 504. 508.
- Apostle of our Profession*, why Christ is so styled, 11 (f) 247. 457.
- Appian*, quoted, 490.

*Aquila,*



# I N D E X.

*Aquila*, the Jew, his version of the Old Testament quoted, 40. 198. 238. 245. 270. 283.  
*Arvieux, Lawrence d'*, quoted, 250.  
*Atmosphere*, formation of the, at the creation, 91.  
*Atbanasius*, quoted, 425 (*m*)

## B.

*Bafnage, James*, quoted, 200.  
*Beau, M. le*, quoted, 497. 498. 500.  
*Bengelius, J. A.* quoted, 14 (*k*) 140. 141. 147. 519.  
*Benson, Dr.* quoted, 146. 492. 514.  
*Blayney, Mr.* quoted, 184. 196. 204. 206. 213. 226. 248. 257. 477.  
*Bochart, Samuel*, quoted, 184.  
*Bos, Lambert*, quoted, 185. 198. 211. 218. 244. 249.  
*Bowyer, Mr.* his opinion concerning the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. 145 (*s*)  
*Brassicanus, John Alexander*, quoted, 516. — suspected to have inserted the *Three witnesses* in Eucherius's citation of 1 John v. 7. 516.  
*Berlin MS.* asserted by Mr. Travis to be ancient, but in reality nothing more than a transcript of the Complutensian edition of the New Testament, 528.  
*Bryant, Mr.* quoted, 241.  
*Buxtorf*, quoted, 42. 281. 282. 386. 469. 476. 504.

## C.

*Calmet, D. Augustine*, quoted, 449.  
*Calvin, John*, his interpretation of John xii. 26. p. 23. 86.  
*Cappellus, Lewis*, quoted, 39. 47. 244. 247.  
*Cerintus*, his doctrine concerning Christ, 444 (*d*)  
*Chaldeans*, their opinion of the eternity of matter, 89.  
*Chambers, Mr.* his Cyclopædia quoted, 106.  
*Chandler, Bishop*, quoted, 239.

*Chandler,*

# I N D E X.

*Chandler, Dr. Samuel*, quoted, 261, 262, 264, 336.

*Chardin, Sir John*, quoted, 250, 285.

*Clarins*, quoted, 490.

*Christians*, their religion, in the 4th century, differed very little in external appearance from that of the Greeks and Romans, 472. 498.

*Constantine*, Antichrist, or the ecclesiastico-political power, first centered at Constantinople, upon his conversion, 470—his intolerant conduct toward the Donatists, 481—the number of impostures, &c. practised in the church since his time, 485—repealed the Julian and Papian laws enacted in favour of those that married and had children, 493—his veneration for the monastic life, 494—his largesses to the clergy, and exemptions in their favour, 500—the motives that produced his conversion, 495—the use he made of his pretended vision, 498.

*Constantinople*, the patriarch of, his ambition excited by the proximity and favour of the imperial court, 471—the capture of that city, by the Turks, conducive to the future downfall of antichristian superstition, 507.

*Councils*, their Antichristian power under Constantine and his successors, 479.

**CHRIST**, the meaning of his saying, "in my Father's house are many mansions," 1—his early wisdom, 5—his public ministry, *ib.*—in what respect he calls himself glorified, 6.—why styled, "The Apostle of our Profession," 11 (*f*) 247. 454.—sometimes spoken of as the Servant, as well as the Son, of God, 14, (*k*)—what he intended by coming again to his disciples, 19. 25. 27—by sending another comforter, 20, 21, (*o*) 39—and by receiving his disciples to himself, 22. 25.—the glory which he prayed for, no antecedent honour and dignity, 23, 24, (*q*) 412—what he intended by manifesting himself to his disciples, 26. 63. 75, 76—and by coming with his Father, to abide with them, *ib.*—his silence before his judges, and at the time of his sufferings, foretold by Isaiah, 42.—his condemnation extorted from

# I N D E X.

from Pontius Pilate, 44.—His being “the way, the truth, and the life,” explained, 53—what he intended by the expression, “I am in the Father, and the Father in me,” 56. (f) 57. 75.—what is signified by the name of Christ, 58. (b) 69—in what sense he is the advocate for sinners, 60, (l) what he intended by “the Spirit of Truth,” 60 (π)—and by “the Prince of this World,” 68 (q) never commanded his disciples to pray to himself, 74—the habitation of God, the temple where he dwelt, 79—what is to be understood by “the grace of,” 113—the evidence that points him out to be only a creature of the human race, invested with extraordinary powers from God, 391—the meaning of his *coming into the world, coming forth from the Father, coming from God, &c.* 393. 402. (g) 412. 461.—the preface to St. John’s gospel affords no proof of his pre-existence, 398—concerning the expression of his “ascending up into heaven,” in John i. 13. p. 404—further proofs of his proper humanity, 417—in what sense *creation* is ascribed to him, 427—he is “the first born of every creature,” 429—“sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high,” 432—the angels of God were required to worship him, 433—and he preached to the spirits in prison, 437—no foundation for the notion of his having a divine and human nature, 458.

*Christians*, why called the *temple*, or *house of God*, 15—in what sense they are *one* with God, 23 (p.)

*Church, the Christian*, called the “house of God,” 9.

*Cicero*, quoted, 379.

*Clarke, Dr. Samuel*, quoted, 19. 116. 184. 185. 204. 208. 217. 249. 399. 400. 403. 462. (b)

*Clement Alexandrinus*, quoted, 202. 249. 443.

*Clement Romanus*, quoted, 39. 42. 47. 185.

*Clerc, John le*, quoted, 42. 449.

*Cocceius, John*, quoted, 357.

*Comforter*, what our Lord intended by the assurance that he would send *another*, 20. 29. 59. (l) 60. 66.

*Communion*



# I N D E X.

*Communion of the Holy Spirit*, import of that expression, 114.  
135.

*Coverdale*, Bishop, his version of several passages of scripture, 38.  
41. 49. 50. 135. (i) 181. 225. 234. 238. 247. 250.

*Creation*, the history of the, must have been delivered by immediate inspiration, 83.

*Crellius*, *John*, quoted, 41.

## D.

*David*, in what respect he was "the man after God's own heart," 328. 345.

*Daniel*, remarks on one of Porphyry's objections to his prophecies, 508.

*Death*, when used, by a metonymy, to signify punishment in general, 102.

*Demosthenes*, quoted, 98. (2)

*Diodati*, *John*, his Italian version of the Bible, quoted, 273.

*Disciples of Christ*, did not think he would suffer death, 7. 53.—what was intended by their *remitting*, or *retaining*, the sins of men, 121.

*Disciplina Arcani*, the doctrine of secrecy, what, 143 (1)

*Doddridge*, Dr. ingenuously allows 1 John v. 7. to be dubious, 145. (1)—instances wherein he imposes his own ideas upon the sacred text, 393. 401. 408. 412.—His paraphrase and note on Jude iv. commended, 444, (c)—principally prevented from becoming a Socinian, by an interpolated passage in Rev. i. 11. p. 447.—Remarks on his interpretation of Rev. iii. 14 p. 449.—and on John xx. 28. p. 465.

*Dublin MS.* asserted to be ancient by Mr. Travis, but without any grounds, 525.

*Durell*, Dr. quoted, 38. 185. 197.

## E.

*Eckard*, Mr. quoted, 470. 495. 498.

*Ecclesiastical Courts*, first establishment of, 501.

*Egyptians*,

# I N D E X.

- Egyptians*, thought matter eternal, 85.  
*Elser*, quoted, 17 (m)  
*Emlyn*, Mr. his inquiry into the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. p. 139. 327—his learning and unblemished integrity, 514.  
*Erasmus*, the motives groundlessly ascribed to him by Mr. Travis, for rejecting 1 John v. 7. in the two first editions of the New Testament, 513—his blameable timidity in inserting it in the subsequent editions, 140. (g) 513.  
*Ewanston*, Mr. quoted, 191. 470. 508.  
*Eucherius*, Bishop. See Travis.  
*Eusebius*, Bishop, quoted, 210. 230. 342. 499.

## F.

- Farmer*, Mr. his "Essay on the Demoniacs of the New Testament," commended, 41—and his "Inquiry into the nature, &c. of Christ's temptation, 47—his "Essay on Miracles," quoted, 68 (g) 240—and commended, 218—his explanation of the expression, "Lord of Hosts," 183—his Treatise on Idolatry, quoted, 216.  
*Felix Pratensis*, quoted, 473.  
*First-born of every Creature*, import of that expression, 439.  
*Ferrius*, Francis, quoted, 224.  
*For ever*, instances of the limited sense of that expression, 60 (m).

## G.

- Gibbon*, Mr. well-grounded in his censure of the persons who inserted 1 John v. 7 in the New Testament, 512.  
*Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, what, 15. 20. 29—extraordinary miracles wrought by them, 57 (g)—indifferently styled *the Spirit* or *the Holy Spirit*, 115. (a) 121.  
*Glasius*, Samuel, quoted, 401 (d)  
*God*, how glorified by Christ, 6—represented frequently as speaking of himself in the third person, 48—in what the knowledge of him consists, 54 (c)—in what sense the disciples

# I N D E X.

ciples of Christ had seen him, *ib.* (s)—how Christ could be glorified in Him, 58 (k)—how he dwells and makes his abode with men, 78, 79—God, the Father, the only true God, 77.

God, in the Hebrew *Elohim*, *Gods*, an idiom of that language, 86.

Grabe, Dr. quoted, 185.

Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the blessings of the gospel intended by that expression, 113.

Griesbach, Dr. a learned Trinitarian, rejects 1 John v. 7. from his edition of the New Testament, 139—his state of the evidence to evince the spuriousness of that text, 140—proves that Eucherius did not cite it, 516—that the preface ascribed to Jerom was written long after his time, 521—maintains the Dublin MS. to be of late date, 528—asserts the Berlin MS. to be only the transcript of a printed edition of the New Testament, 529—further quotations from this author, 209. 253. 425. (m) 437. (u) 442—444. (b) 446.

Grotius, quoted, 60 (m) 183. 250. 253. 410. 430 (s) 431. 449.

## H.

Habesci, Elias, quoted, 503.

Hallett, Mr. quoted, 221. 244. 249. 377. 388.

Hammond, Dr. quoted, 253. 397. 409. 437 (u) 447.

Harmer, Mr. quoted, 196. 207. 215. 221. 230. 250.

Hartley, Dr. quoted, 107 (s)

Hebrew Idiom, instances of, 86. 90. 307.

Hegeffippus, quoted, 202.

Hell, Hades, meaning of that word, 216.

Heraclius, Prince, reflections on his alliance with Russia, 502.

Holy Ghost, remarks on that expression, 135 (k)

Holy Spirit, what is meant by the promise of the, 29. 64. 76.

121—explanation of the passages in the New Testament, in which mention is made of the, 114—sin against the Holy Spirit explained, 116.

Homer,



# I N D E X.

- Homer*, quoted, 296. 364 (c)
- Honorius*, grants authority to four Bishops to persecute heretics unto death, 482—his two famous laws in favour of the clergy, 500.
- Houbigant, Charles-Francis*, quoted, 232. 254.
- House of God*, Jewish and Christian church, so called, 10. See Temple.
- Hunt*, Dr. quoted, 16 (1)
- Hurd*, Bishop, his Commentary on Horace's Epistles to Augustus, and the Piso's recommended to imitation, vii—quotation from his sermons, 438.
- Hutchinson*, Dr. quoted, 208.
- Hyde de Rel. Vet. Pers.* quoted, 241.

## J.

- Jackson*, Mr. quoted, 222. 224. 229. 230. 232. 243. 254—256.
- James, the Apostle*, called a pillar, 9 (c)
- I am that I am*, explanation of that expression, 286.
- Idolatry*, probable origin of, 270. 276. See Jews.
- Jerom*, his idea of the proper mode of interpreting scripture, 85—the preface to the seven Catholic epistles not written by him, as maintained by Mr. Travis, 516—quotations from, 197. 223, 224.
- Jews*, their great corruption about our Saviour's time, 45. 193.—have wilfully corrupted several prophecies relating to the Messiah, 46—more particularly addicted to divination, &c. about the time of Christ, 190. 196—their great wealth in the time of Vespasian, 190—whether they were addicted to idolatry after their return from the Babylonish captivity, 191—the worship of angels probably prevailed much among them, 195.—origin of their war with the Romans, 200. See Israelites.
- Image Worship*, first established at the second council of Nice 472.
- Infants*, concerning the death of, 97—Note, 108.

*John,*

# I N D E X.

- John, the Apostle*, called a pillar, 9 (c).  
*Jerin*, Dr. quoted, 200. 442.  
*Joseph*, reflections on a pathetic passage in the history of, 278.  
*Josephus*, quoted, 17 (m) 45. 189. 190. 193. 196. 199. 205, 210. 212. 223. 228. 260. 279. 313.  
*Irenæus*, quoted, 444 (e).  
*Isaiab*, a new translation of part of, 31. 129.  
*Israelites*, in what sense God was said to *evil-treat* them, 289.  
*Jubb*, Dr. quoted, 38. 149. 221. 222. 227. 230.  
*Junius and Tremellius*, their version quoted, 47. 295. 386.  
*Justin, Martyr*, quoted, 39. 47. 50. 201. 204. 281.  
*Justinian*, his dreadful persecution of those he deemed heretics, 483—the first who gave Bishops a court, 501.  
K.
*Kemnicott*, Dr. quoted, 32 (s) 34. 38. 42. 43. 183. 184. 189. 202. 215. 225. 226. 230. 231. 239. 241. 243. 244. 248. 252. 269. 281. 289. 331. 353. 477.  
*Kypke in Acta Apostolorum*, i. 25, p. 17 (m).  
L.
*LaBantius*, quoted, 42. 43. 50.  
*Lardner*, Dr. quoted, 9 (d) 43. 44. 45. 71. 133. (b) 192. 201. 205. 210. 407. 428 (o) 445 (e) 480.  
*Law*, Bishop, quoted, 47. 191. 196. 259.  
*Lenfant*, quoted, 403.  
*Licinius*, his oration to his army, 497.  
*Light*, observations on the Mosaic account of, 89.  
*Lightfoot*, Dr. quoted, 21 (o) 43. 188.  
*Limborch*, Mr. quoted, 194. 195.  
*Lindsey*, Mr. quoted, 211. 217. 230. 431.  
*Liturgies*, no certain account of their use till the latter end of the fourth century, 475.  
*Locke*, Mr. quoted, 99. 129.  
*Logos*, signification of that word, 79. 400.

*Lord*

# I N D E X.

*Lord of Hosts*, or *Sabaoth*, what that expression means, 183.

*Lowman*, Mr. quoted, 472.

*Lewis*, Bp. his translation of *Isaiah* commended, 31—in what respects defective, ib.—quotations from, or remarks on, several passages in it, 38—45. 47—50. 61 (a) 181—187. 189. 196. 201—207. 211. 213—216. 218. 219. 221. 222. 224—227. 231—236. 239—244. 247. 248. 250—257. 476.—his *Prælectiones de Sacra Poësi Hebræorum*, commended, 33 (a)

## M.

*Man*, mortality of, to be ascribed to personal guilt, not to that of Adam, 97, Note \*

*Many Mansions*, that expression in *John xiv. 2.* does not intend the abodes of future happiness, 1—what it signifies, 18.

*Marcellus*, quoted, 429. (g)

*Matter*, thought by the Chaldeans and Egyptians to be eternal, 85.

*Mede*, Mr. quoted, 48. 188. 216. 234—256. 473. &c.

*Metals*, their formation accounted for, 92.

*Michaelis*, J. H. quoted, 186. 195.

*Mill*, Mr. quoted, 140. 145. (s) 147. 209. 253. 447.

*Millet*, *Abbé*, quoted, 480. &c.

*Mohammed*, the *Impostor*, not an idolater, 506.

*Moses*, supposed by some to have been translated like *Enoch*, 453.

*Mosheim*, J. L. quoted, 437. 471. 475. 481. &c.

## N.

*Neal*, Dr. quoted, 475.

*Newton*, Sir *Isaac*, quoted, 139. 212. 224. 479. 490.

*Newton*, Bishop, quoted, 469—479. 490. &c.

*Noldius*, C. quoted, 288.

*Novatian*, quoted, 243. 246. 255.



# I N D E X.

## O.

- Oceans and Seas*, origin of, 92.  
*Onkelos*, his Chaldaic paraphrase, quoted, 289. 301.  
*Origen*, quoted, 39. 46. 209. 242. 425. (m)  
*Orobio*, the learned Jew, quoted, 194.  
*Owen*, Dr. his "Inquiry into the present State of the Septuagint Version," quoted, 40. 46. 197. 202. 244—246.

## P.

- Panthea*, fine description of her grief, 208.  
*Parkhurst*, Mr. quoted, 474.  
*Patriarchs*, remark on their polygamy, 274.  
*Patrick*, Bishop, quoted, 260. 273. 276. 286. 298. 305. 322. 325. 339.  
*Patronage*, right of, its origin, 475.  
*Paul*, St. his valedictory benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 14, improperly used now, 148.  
*Pearce*, Bishop, quoted, 32. (r) 44. 60 (m) 119 (f) 209, 210. 217. 241. 243.  
*Peirce*, Mr. quoted, 11. 48. 188. 195. 210. 232.—240.  
*Persecution of Christians by Christians*, when and where first begun, 481.  
*Peter*, the Apostle, called a pillar, 9 (c)  
*Peters on Job*, quoted, 40.  
*Pbaraob*, in what sense God hardened his heart, 289.  
*Philosophy*, ancient, its process in endeavouring to unfold the laws of the visible creation, ii.  
*Plato*, his school, 143 (s)  
*Polygamy*. See *Patriarchs*.  
*Polyglot*, quoted, 42, &c.  
*Porphyry*, remarks on one of his objections to the prophecies of Daniel, 508.  
*Praying in the Name of Christ*, to whom the injunction for, related, 69.

*Prideaux*,

# I N D E X

*Prideaux*, Dr. quoted, 346.

*Priestley*, Dr. his discovery of the purification of the atmosphere, by the growth of vegetables, 93—his "History of Opinions concerning Jesus Christ," commended, 430 (g)—quotations from his works, 107 (a) 143 (r) 248. 481, &c.

*Prince of this World*, *Prince of the Powers of the Air*, &c. what is meant by those expressions, 68 (g)

*Private Judgment in religious Concernments*, great importance of, ix.

*Prophecies*, the study of the, recommended, 509.

*Prophecy*, Gift of, what, 127.

*Pyle*, Mr. quoted, 14 (k) 98 Note, 209.

## R.

*Randolph*, Dr. on the Prophecies, &c. cited in the New Testament, commended, 48—quoted, 219.

*Raphelius*, the Son, quoted, 404.

*Religion*, the great ends and objects of, i.

*Revelation*, why so partially acknowledged as the guide of human life, ii.

*Robinson*, Mr. the "Examination of his plea for the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ," quoted, 432 (r)

## S.

*Shechinah*, the manifestation of the presence of God, 168. 270. 272.

*Schultens*, *Albers*, quoted, 357.

*Scriptures*, proper mode of interpreting the, 84.

*Scriptural Knowledge*, method of advancing, stated, vi.

*Secker*, Archbishop, quoted, 185. 250.

*Stuckford*, Mr. quoted, 260. 263.

*Slavery*, prevalent in the earliest times, 274.

*Society*, for promoting Scripture Knowledge, Plan of the, i.

*Sociants,*

# INDEX.

- Socius*, his opinion concerning Adam's mortality, 106. 109.  
 (A)—his chimerical notion that Christ had been literally taken up into Heaven after his baptism, 407. 403. (B)—that notion not adopted by the Socinians in general, ib.  
*Spanhemius*, E. quoted, 208.  
*Spencer de Legibus Heb.* 244.  
*Spirit of God*, illustration of that expression, 88. 114. (d).  
*Spirit of Truth*, what Christ intended by that expression, 60. (n) 436. See Comforter and Holy Spirit.  
*Spiritual Tyranny*, first sprung up in the East, 472.  
*Steele*, Sir Richard, censured, 279.  
*Stephens*, R. inserted 1 John v. 7. in his printed Greek Testament without authority, 521—weakly defended by Mr. Travis, ib.—true state of the subject respecting him, 522—525.  
*Stones*, their formation accounted for, 92.  
*Sykes*, Dr. quoted, 32. (1) 42. 46. 49. 188. 244. 473.  
*Symmachus*, his version of the Old Testament, quoted, 39. 40. 42. 238. 245. 249. 255. 268. 283.

## T.

- Tacitus*, quoted, 457.  
*Taylor*, Dr. quoted, 40—49. 101—104. 129. 181—185. 191. 204. 208. 219. 235. 260. 357. 473—476. 481. 490. &c.  
*Temple of God*, why Christians are so called, 15. 79. See Christ.  
*Tertullian*, quoted, 41—50. 181. 189. 202. 219. 237. 243. &c.  
*Theodosius the Great*, his dreadful severity to those he called heretics, 481. 502.  
*Theodosius II.* his similar conduct, 482. his law in favour of Ecclesiastics, 501.  
*Theodotion, the Jew*, his version of the Old Testament quoted, 40. 42. 245. 249. 268.  
*Thucydides*, quoted, 98 Note.

*Travis*,



# I N D E X

*Travis*, Mr. vindicates the authenticity of 1 John v. 7. page 147. (s) 511—his weak and ignorant charge against Mr. Emlyn, concerning Eucherius's citation of that text, 515—a very improper defender of the Gospel, and opposer of Mr. Gibbon, 529.

*Trinity in Unity*, the Doctrine of, void of all just foundation in the Scriptures, 148.—a belief in it, insisted upon by only one colony in America, 484.

## V.

*Valentinian III.* his laws in favour of the clergy, 501.

*Valla*, L. said by Mr. Travis to have been possessed of seven MSS. in which 1 John v. 7. was found, 517.—no proof that he possessed one such MS. 518.

*Van Hooght*, quoted, 473.

*Vatable*, quoted, 405.

*Vigilius Tapsensis*, in the latter end of the fifth century, the first who cites 1 John v. 7. p. 141.—a man of doubtful character, 142.—the supposed author of the Creed of Athanasius, 142.—Dr. Griesbach's conjecture concerning him, 146. (s).

*Virgil*, quoted, 301.

*Volcanos*, existed at the creation, 89.

*Uniformity*, with respect to opinions, the first Act of, passed A. D. 482. page 494.

*Usher*, Bishop, quoted, 222, &c.

## W.

*Wall*, Dr. quoted, 145. (s).

*Walton*, Bishop, quoted, 198.

*Wetstein*, J. J. proves it to be quite uncertain that Valla possessed any ancient MSS. of the New Testament which had the disputed text 1 John v. 7. page 517.—shews that R. Stephens possessed no ancient Greek MSS which had this text, 522—quoted, 44. 140. 147. 192. 195. 209. 253; 254. 425. (m). 444. (c). 455.

*Whiston's*

# INDEX.

*Whiston's Boyle's Lectures*, quoted, 40, 41.  
*Whitby*, Dr. quoted, 43. 45. 197. 210. 225. 254.  
*Wolfinus*, quoted, 57 (g).  
*Wotton*, Mr. quoted, 42. 185.  
*Wynne*, Mr. his note on 1 John v. 7. page 146. (1).

## X.

*Xenophon*, quoted, 208.  
*Ximenes*, Cardinal, his Spanish edition of the New Testament,  
 140. (g).

EXODUS		GENESIS	
1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9
10	10	10	10
11	11	11	11
12	12	12	12
13	13	13	13
14	14	14	14
15	15	15	15
16	16	16	16
17	17	17	17
18	18	18	18
19	19	19	19
20	20	20	20
21	21	21	21
22	22	22	22
23	23	23	23
24	24	24	24
25	25	25	25
26	26	26	26
27	27	27	27
28	28	28	28
29	29	29	29
30	30	30	30
31	31	31	31
32	32	32	32
33	33	33	33
34	34	34	34
35	35	35	35
36	36	36	36
37	37	37	37
38	38	38	38
39	39	39	39
40	40	40	40
41	41	41	41
42	42	42	42
43	43	43	43
44	44	44	44
45	45	45	45
46	46	46	46
47	47	47	47
48	48	48	48
49	49	49	49
50	50	50	50
51	51	51	51
52	52	52	52
53	53	53	53
54	54	54	54
55	55	55	55
56	56	56	56
57	57	57	57
58	58	58	58
59	59	59	59
60	60	60	60
61	61	61	61
62	62	62	62
63	63	63	63
64	64	64	64
65	65	65	65
66	66	66	66
67	67	67	67
68	68	68	68
69	69	69	69
70	70	70	70
71	71	71	71
72	72	72	72
73	73	73	73
74	74	74	74
75	75	75	75
76	76	76	76
77	77	77	77
78	78	78	78
79	79	79	79
80	80	80	80
81	81	81	81
82	82	82	82
83	83	83	83
84	84	84	84
85	85	85	85
86	86	86	86
87	87	87	87
88	88	88	88
89	89	89	89
90	90	90	90
91	91	91	91
92	92	92	92
93	93	93	93
94	94	94	94
95	95	95	95
96	96	96	96
97	97	97	97
98	98	98	98
99	99	99	99
100	100	100	100

## TEXTS

# T E X T S

## S C R I P T U R E

### EXPLAINED AND ILLUSTRATED.

#### GENESIS.

	Page
CHAP. i. 1—21	83—104
ii. 17. iii. 19	99
iv. 11—26	259—269
v. 22. 24	355
vi. 3	271
ix. 10. 13. 16	272, 273
xiv. 14	274
xv. 19. xvi. 13	276
xx. 11. 14	ibid.
xxvi. 7	277
xxx. 11	ibid.
xxxv. 7	ibid.
xli. 48	ibid.
— 56	278
xlii. 16	ibid.
— 30	86
xliii. 28	279
xlvi. 21	ibid.
xlvi. 16. 21	280
xliv. 10	281
— 15. 23—26	283
l. 23	286

#### EXODUS.

	Page
iii. 6. 14	286
— 19	287
— 22	288
v. 5	ibid.
— 13. 22	289
vi. 20	ibid.
viii. 9	ibid.
— 19. 23	290
x. 8—11	ibid.
xiv. 7	291
xvii. 16	292
xix. 13	293
xxi. 13	105
xxiii. 5	294
xxiv. 10, 11	ibid.
xxv. 19	295
xxxii. 10	296
xl. 17	ibid.

#### LEVITICUS.

xxvi. 11, 12	15
--------------	----

#### NUMBERS.



# TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE.

## NUMBERS.

	Page
xi. 25	296
xiv. 9	ibid.
— 23. 28, 29	297
xxi. 14	298
xxiii. 3—15. 23. 29	300
xxiv. 7	301
— 18, 19	302
xxv. 4. 9	303

## DEUTERONOMY.

ii. 10—12	303
xx. 19	304
xxxii. 5	34 (u)
— 8	305
— 39	308
xxxiii. 4	ibid.
— 6	309
xxxiv. 1—3	ibid.

## JUDGES.

iv. 8	310
v. 13, 14	ibid.
ix. 38. 41	312
x. 8. 12	ibid.
xii. 7	313
xvii. 7	ibid.
xix. 2	ibid.

## 1 SAMUEL.

i. 18	183. 313
i. 22	87
— 28	313
ii. 5. 31	314
— 32, 33	315
v. 8	316
ix. 24	ibid.
xii. 21	ibid.
xv. 12	317
xvi. 10	ibid.
xviii. 21. xxv. 26	318
xxviii. 17	ibid.

a

## 2 SAMUEL.

	Page
i. 18	318
ii. 8	322
iii. 22	319
vi. 2. 21	320
vii. 16	ibid.
— 28	321
viii. 13	ibid.
ix. 11	322
x. 18	292
xi. 11. 21	322
xii. 31	336
xvi. 10, 11	88
xxi. 8	286. 323

## 1 KINGS.

i. 48	323
xi. 33	324
xii. 2. 20	ibid.
— 32, 33	325
xv. 5	327
— 6	328
xx. 38. 41	ibid.
xxii. 13	329

## 2 KINGS.

i. 10. 12	329
vi. 33	ibid.
vii. 13	331
viii. 19	341
ix. 27	332
x. 24	333
xvii. 27. 33	ibid.
— 34	334
xviii. 2	335
xxiii. 13	336

## 1 CHRONICLES.

xx. 3	336
xxvii. 18	338
xxix. 20	452 (f)

2 CHRON.

# TEXTS of SCRIPTURE.

## 2 CHRONICLES.

	Page
i. 13	338
iii. 10	ibid.
iv. 16	ibid.
v. 13	339
xii. 1	340
xvii. 34	ibid.
xviii. 12	329
xx. 34	340
xxi. 7. 12	341
xxiv. 15	ibid.
— 26	342
xxv. 6. 13	ibid.
— 20	343
xxvi. 8	ibid.
xxviii. 10	ibid.
xxix. 19	334
xxxvi. 10. 21	ibid.

## EZRA.

iv. 2. 9	223
----------	-----

## NEHEMIAH.

iv. 12	347
— 23	348
vi. 19	ibid.

## ESTHER.

i. 18	349
-------	-----

## JOB.

vi. 14	349
viii.	350
ix. 19	ibid.
xviii. 4	ibid.
xxii. 20	351
xxiv. 12. 18	ibid.
xxvi. 3	352
xxviii. 4	ibid.

## JOB.

	Page
xxx. 2. 13. 15	352
xxxvi. 20	353
— 30. 33	354
xxxvii. 12	355
— 13	356
xli. 22	ibid.

## PSALMS.

viii. 2	356
x. 6	357
xii. 5	358
xiii. 2	357
xxii.	48. 358
xxvii. 12. 13	365
xxxv. 7	366
xxxvii. 14	367
xl. 6	ibid.
lviii. 1	ibid.
— 7	368
lxv. 3	369
lxix. 26	ibid.
lxxiii. 10	ibid.
lxxvi. 6	370
lxxvii. 10	ibid.
lxxviii. 41	371
lxxx. 6	ibid.
lxxxii. 16	ibid.
lxxxiii. 6, 7	372
lxxxix. 35	297
— 50	372
xc. 9	373
xciv. 11	ibid.
xcv. 9—11	374
cii. 27	308
cix. 18	375
cxix. 113	376
— 128	377
cxxx. 5, 6	378
cxl. 8, 9	ibid.

## PROVERBS.

# TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE.

## PROVERBS.

	Page
li. 7	379
vi. 18. 22	ibid.
vii. 22, 23	ibid.
x. 16	380
xi. 7	ibid.
— 9	381
xiv. 24	ibid.
xvii. 21	382
xix. 22	ibid.
xxi. 6. 8. 12	383
xxii. 8. 21	384
xxiii. 35	ibid.
xxvi. 6	385
— 10	386
— 23	387
xxix. 10. 19	ibid.
xxx. 10	ibid.
xxxi. 1	ibid.

## ISAIAH.

i. —xii.	149—258
xi. 1, 2	60 (n)
xix. 15	250
xxxviii. 27	244
xlii. 19	39
xlvi. 1, &c.	205
lii. 13—liii. 12	31—50
liii. 11	247
lxv. 4	244

## JEREMIAH.

x. 19	371
xiv. 1, 2	206
xxiii. 13, 14	257. 351
xxxii. 18	348

## EZEKIEL.

xxxiii. 1—20	60 (l)
— 30	207

## DANIEL.

viii. 8—14	1258 467—485
— 21—25	468—485
ix. 12	375
xi. 31—39	486—503
xii.	503—509

## HOSEA.

ix. 10	315 Note
--------	----------

## AMOS.

ix. 12.	40
---------	----

## ZECHARIAH.

x. 10, 11	256
xi. 9	250

## MATTHEW.

i. 18	114
— 23	226. 229
iii. 11	115. 119 (g)
vii. 7	118, 119 (f)
— 11	118
viii. 17	32. 41
— 22	396
x. 19	115 (d) 122
— 20	80. 115 (d) 117
— 22	209
xi. 18, 19	396 (c)
xii. 28	114 (d)
— 32	116
— 39	192
xvi. 4	ibid.
xxi. 16	356
— 25	405 (b)
xxiv. 13. 22. 24	209
xxvii. 46	359
xxviii. 19	116. 147, 148
— 20	64

## MARK.



# TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE.

## MARK.

	Page
i. 8	115
— 38	116
iii. 29	ibid.
xi. 20—24	70. 119
xii. 36	116
xiii. 11	115 (d) 117

## LUKE.

i. 25	117
— 35	114
— 41. 67	117
— 48 52	43
ii. 25, 26	117
iii. 16	115
— 22	117
iv. 1	117. 124
xi. 1, 2	74
— 13	118
— 20	114 (d)
xii. 10	116
— 12	117
xxi. 18, 19	209

## JOHN.

i. 1	398
— 6	394 (b)
— 7	396 (c)
— 9	379
— 14	79, 400
— 15	400
— 18	55 (e)
— 33	119
iii. 13	404
— 17	394
— 34	61 (n) 79, 115 (e)
—	117. 402 (g)
iv. 38	57 (g)
v. 45	60 (f)
vi. 14	396
— 22. 33. 50, 51	405

## JOHN.

	Page
vi. 62	406
vii. 21	98 Note
— 33	408
— 39	120
— 12. 27	409
viii. 39, 40	413
— 42	394. 397
— 50	25
— 56	217
— 58	408
x. 38	56 (f)
xi. 27	397
xii. 26	22. 80, 81
— 31	68 (g)
— 40	220
— 41	217
— 46	396
xiii. 3	52 (a) 121. 411
— 33—37	52
xiv. 1—3	1—30
— 3	1. 19. 22. 80
— 4—31	51—82
— 13. 14	28. 71
— 15—18	20
— 16, 17	59. 120
— 17	416
— 21—23	26. 65, 76
xiv. 26	66. 120
xv. 7	71
— 16	28. 71
— 27	54 (d)
xvi. 5	408
— 16	21 (o)
— 23, 24	28. 71, 72 (s)
— 26	73
— 28	394
xvii. 1—3	77
— 4	67 (p)
— 5	24 (q) 410. 412
— 8	394
— 21	23
— 22	23. 413
xvii. 24	

# TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE.

## JOHN.

	Page
xvii. 24 - - 24. 80.	82
xviii. 37 - - 391.	397
xx. 17 - - -	413
- 22. 3 - - -	120
- 28 - - -	464

## A C T S.

i. 1, 2 5 - - -	121
- 8. 16 - - -	122
- 25 - - -	16
ii. - - 29. 57 (g)	119
- 4 - - 115 (e)	122
- 22. 24. 36 - - -	423
- 23 - - -	249. 423
- 33. 38 - - -	122
iii. 6 - - -	70
- 21 - - -	28
iv. 8 31 - - -	122
- 12 - - -	52 (b)
- 27. 30 - - -	14 (k)
v. 3. 4. 32 - - -	123
vi. 3. 5 - - -	ibid.
vii. 51. 55 - - -	123
viii. 15-20 - - -	124
ix. 17. 31 - - -	ibid.
x. 38 - - -	ibid.
- 41-47 - - -	125, &c
xi. 15-17 - - -	115 125
- 24 - - -	125
xiii. 2. 4 - - -	ibid.
- 19. 28 - - -	ibid.
- 52 - - -	126
xv. 8. 28 - - -	ibid.
xvi. 6, 7 - - 115 (e)	127
xvii. 23 - - -	424
- 28 - - -	75
xix. 2 - - 29.	127
xx. 23 - - -	127
- 28 - - -	425 (m)
xxi. 10, 11 - - -	128
xxviii. 25 - - -	ibid.

## ROMANS.

	Page
ii. 12 - - -	99
iv. 15 - - -	98 Note
v. 5 - - -	128
- 8-24 - - -	94-111
viii. 20 - - -	104
- 29 - - -	430 (r)
ix. 1 - - -	128
- 5 - - -	434 (r)
- 28 - - -	253
x. 13 - - -	210
xii. 6-8 - - -	57 (g)
xiv. 9 - - -	428
- 17 - - -	129
xv. 13. 15. 16 - - -	ibid.
xvi. 7 - - -	10 (e)

## 1 CORINTHIANS.

i. 15 - - -	431
- 16 - - -	430 (j)
- 30 - - 113. 235.	237
iii. 16 - - -	15. 80
- 20 - - -	373
vi. 19 - - -	123. 129
ix. 12-14 - - -	429
x. 16 - - -	135 (i)
xii.-xiv. - - 133. 134.	138
xii. 16 - - -	18
- - - 57 (g)	130. 134
xv. 20, 21 - - -	103

## 2 CORINTHIANS.

v. 17 - - -	10 (e)
vi. 4. 6 - - -	130
- 16 - - -	15. 123
xiii. 4 - - -	436 (u)
- 14 - - 112. 134. 147.	148

## GALATIANS.

i. 22 - - -	10 (e)
-------------	--------

# TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE.

## EPHESIANS.

	Page
i. 13	136 (k)
ii. 4	68 (y)
— 19—22	9
iv. 20	29
— 30	130. 136 (k)
v. 18, 19	137 (m)

## PHILIPPIANS.

iv. 13	29
--------	----

## COLOSSIANS.

i. 16, 17	425 (o)
ii. 18	195

## 1 THESSALONIANS.

i. 5, 6	131
iv. 8	136 (k)
v. 4, 5, 7, 8	396

## 2 THESSALONIANS.

iii. 12	492
---------	-----

## 1 TIMOTHY.

ii. 5	427
iii. 15	9
— 16	139 (o) 434 (t)
vi. 16	55 (x)

## 2 TIMOTHY.

i. 14	131
-------	-----

## TITUS.

iii. 5, 6	131
-----------	-----

## PHILEMON.

	Page
18	101

## HEBREWS.

i. 2	427. 432
i. 8	433
ii. 3	432
— 4	132. 240
iii. 1	247
— 1—7	11—15
iii. 7, 8	132
— 9—11	374
vi. 4	132
— 17	249
ix. 8	132
— 27	108
x. 15	132
— 26	105
xi. 9—11	433
xii. 2	82

## 1 PETER.

i. 12	132
— 13	436
ii. 7—10	236
— 24	32 (x)
iii. 18, 19	436

## 2 PETER.

i. 21	133
iii. 5	105

## 1 JOHN



# TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE

## I JOHN

i. 13	-	-	440
ii. 1	-	-	59 (7)
- 18. 22	-	-	440
iii. 16	-	-	442
vi. 2, 3, 7	-	-	441
v. 7	-	138. 148.	442
-	-	511-539	442
- 8	-	141,	442
- 20	-	-	442

## JUDE.

1	-	-	443
3, 4	-	-	444
20, 21	-	-	133

## REVELATION.

i. 4, 5	-	-	448
- 8. 11	-	-	446
ii. 23	-	-	448
iii. 14	-	-	449
- 20	-	-	27 (r)
- 22	-	-	448
iv. 8-11	-	-	449
v. 5	-	-	451
v. 6-13	-	-	450
vii. 9, 10	-	-	452
xiii. 8	-	-	410
- 11	-	-	470
xiv. 6, 7	-	-	450
xv. 3, 4	-	-	453
xxii. 13	-	-	454

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.



## ERRATA.

### Page

- 95, line 11, instead of the full stop after *tended*, place (—)  
77, line 29, for *than him*, read *than he*.  
80, line 24, for *determine* read *deter*.  
98, Note on ver. 11, for *printed* read *pointed*.  
99, line 15, for *ver. 9*, read *v. g.* (*verbi gratia*,)  
100, last line, for 63 read 13.  
111, line 3, for *general* read *original*.  
112, the last line, read *signifies grace, favour, &c.*  
139, ditto, read *collating the most, &c.*  
144, line 9, read *greater*.  
163, line 3 from bottom, for *house* read *temple*.  
196, line 20, for *twelve* read *fifteen*.  
205, last line, for *xlix.* read *xlvi.*  
252, line 14, insert *not*, after *θαλασσης*.  
403, last line, for *then me*, read *than I*.